

THE
LAST WARNING VOICE;

OR, AN EXPOSITION OF

THE PROPHECIES:

SHOWING THAT THE SECOND PERSONAL APPEARING OF OUR
LORD JESUS CHRIST WILL TAKE PLACE
NO LATER THAN A. D. 1867.

BY

S S. BREWER AND A. DECKER.

ADVENTIST
HERITAGE CENTER
James White Library
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

"HERALD OF THE BRIDEGROOM" PRINT,
NEWARK, N. J.

1866.

Loaned to General Conference
by--
New England School of
Theology.
June 1933.

ADVENT SOURCE COLLECTION

General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists

WASHINGTON, D. C.

No. **337**

ASC

BS

647

B73

HER.

PREFACE.

In sending out this pamphlet, we believe we are giving the last and most important truth that has ever been submitted to the world for its consideration. To careful observers the signs of the times have spoken of some great event at hand. The disturbed state of the nations, and the great revolutionary spirit of the age carry with them the conviction, that we are on the eve of the grand political earthquake that will shake this sin-cursed earth from centre to circumference. What has distinguished the Adventists, as a religious sect, is the fact that they have believed that the time of the second advent being re-vealed, would be understood by the Church prior to that event, else the Revelation would fail to accomplish the object for which it was given, viz.: to "show unto his servants the things which must shortly come to pass." It is true that we have been disappointed in previous calculations, but that is no evidence of future mistakes. The declaration still remains in-tact. "Ye, brethren, are not in darkness that *that day* should overtake you as a thief." Each disappointment has been but the incentive to renewed investigation, without which we could never have attained to a correct understanding of "the times and seasons." Again, we have the promise that "the wise *shall understand*," which will certainly be fulfilled. We send out these pages for the consideration of the Church, hoping they will read and carefully consider in a manner commensu-rate with the solemn importance of the subject. The book of Revelation, hitherto almost unintelligible, is at last, we believe, correctly understood, and from its pages shines the clear light of prophecy. Our past arguments were almost wholly drawn from Daniel, therefore, defective. The Revelation being the last and greatest prophecy given to the Church, carries with it the undeniable fact that all previous prophecy was insuffi-cient, and, therefore, it follows as a necessity, that the truth could not be obtained without thoroughly consulting this greatest of prophetic oracles. Our object has been to treat these subjects in such a manner as to enable a child to under-stand them, and we believe that, to all inquiring minds, an

honest perusal will be followed by a firm conviction of the correctness of our position. Such unmistakable fulfillments of prophecy as are furnished from the page of history, we think, cannot fail to convince an unprejudiced mind of the fact that the coming of our blessed Lord is, at most, but a few months distant. This will be glad tidings to the lonely pilgrims' heart, who, though oft disappointed, are still "looking for that blessed hope," and are longing for that day that shall witness their transition from these scenes of sorrow and sadness, to the immortal joys of the kingdom of Christ. To those who are, as yet, strangers to this hope, we trust a perusal of these pages will beget a desire to be partakers, with us, of such ineffable glory so soon to be revealed, and result in the realization of that desire through immediate "repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ."

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

THE TIME TO BE UNDERSTOOD.—(By W. N. PILE.) PAGE.

"But of that day and that hour knoweth no man."—Mark xiii: 32	9-10
"Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left. Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken and the other left"	10-13
Numerous passages found to be in conflict with the text, if it applies to all future time	13-15
The Scriptures harmonized	15-21

CHAPTER II.

THE GREAT RED DRAGON OF REV. XII.

What it symbolizes	22-24
The seven heads and ten horns	24
"His tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the ground"	24-25
"War in heaven"	25
"And the serpent cast out of his mouth water, as a flood, after the woman"	26-28

CHAPTER III.

THE BEAST LIKE A LEOPARD OF REV. XIII.

This beast does not represent the papacy, but the imperial power controlling both civil and ecclesiastical matters	29-30
The time of the rise of this beast	31
The seven successive heads of the beast	31-38
Commencement of the "forty-two months'" war on the saints	39-40
Their termination in the French Revolution	40-44
The 1335 days of Daniel shown to reach to the resurrection	45-46

CHAPTER IV.

EXPOSITION OF THE "LITTLE HORN" AND HIS "WAR WITH THE SAINTS."

A horn invariably symbolizes a civil, not an ecclesiastical, power	47-48
The "eyes and mouth" in this horn constitutes the only difference between this and all others	48
The "eyes and mouth" explained to be an apostate Church	48-50
The result of the union of the "eyes and mouth" with the "horn"	50
The time of its rise shown to be after the ten divisions of the Western Roman empire	50-52

The time of its union with "the mother of harlots," or the "Roman Catholic Church" - - - - -	52-53
Reasons for our past disappointments - - - - -	54-55
Establishment of "toleration of all religious worship" and end of the war on the saints by the "little horn," or "beast like a leopard," in 1792 - - - - -	55-56

CHAPTER V.

THE ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION OF MATT. XXIV.

Showing that it was not "set up" at the destruction of Jerusalem - - - - -	56-58
What constitutes the "abomination of desolation" - - - - -	59-60
The "daily sacrifice" - - - - -	60-61
The "holy place," or "sanctuary of strength" - - - - -	61-62
The time when the "daily sacrifice" was taken away and the "abomination" placed in its stead, or in the "holy place". - - - - -	62-64
The time when the "abomination" was taken from the "holy place," and the "daily sacrifice" restored by decree of toleration - - - - -	64-65

CHAPTER VI.

THE PROPHESYING OF THE "TWO WITNESSES" CLOTHED IN SACKCLOTH.

What is symbolized by the "two witnesses" - - - - -	66-68
Their prophesying in sackcloth and the time of its commencement - - - - -	68-69
The end of their testimony in sackcloth, when they are slain by the "beast out of the bottomless pit" - - - - -	69
The time of its fulfillment 1792 - - - - -	69-74

CHAPTER VII.

THE HOLY CITY TRODDEN UNDER FOOT "FORTY AND TWO MONTHS."

What is meant by the "holy city," showing that it represents the "true Church" - - - - -	75-76
--	-------

CHAPTER VIII.

THE "WOMAN" FED AND "NOURISHED" IN THE "WILDERNESS" "A THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND THREESCORE DAYS" FROM THE FACE OF THE SERPENT.

The importance of this portion of prophecy - - - - -	77
The woman proved to be a symbol - - - - -	77
What is meant by the "two wings of a great eagle" and when they were given her - - - - -	78-79
The woman shown to represent an apostate Church from the time of the addition of the "two wings," or the two grand divisions, of the Roman empire - - - - -	79-80
The "remnant"—the representative of the true Church - - - - -	80-81
What is meant by "the wilderness" in this prophecy - - - - -	81
The time when the woman began to be "fed and nourished" "from the face of the serpent" - - - - -	82-84
The termination of the 1260 years - - - - -	84-87
The thousand two hundred and ninety days - - - - -	87-90

CONTENTS.

VII

CHAPTER IX.

EXPOSITION OF THE DRAGON AND THE THOUSAND YEARS OF REV. XX.

Prefatory remarks	- - - - -	91-92
The angel that binds the dragon is not Christ	- - - - -	92-93
The angel, key, chain and bottomless pit are all symbols	- - - - -	93 94
The dragon of the 12th and 20th chapters are identical, and as such, symbolize the Heathen Roman empire	- - - - -	94-96
The thrones of Rev. xx: 4, proved to be those of the seven kings of Rev. xvii	- - - - -	96-98
The time when the dragon was bound, together with the commencement of the thousand years in 792, and their termination in 1792	- - - - -	98-102
The thousand years' reign with Christ	- - - - -	102-109
The dragon being loosed, goes out to deceive the nations and "to gather them together to battle"	- - - - -	109-111

CHAPTER X.

THE DARKENING OF THE SUN.

The end of the "great tribulation"	- - - - -	112-113
The four watches, showing their fulfillment in the different time movements and disappointments, by W. N. PILE	- - - - -	114-117

CHAPTER XI.

EXPOSITION OF THE TWO THOUSAND AND THREE HUNDRED DAYS OF DAN. VIII: 14.

Showing at what event these days terminate	- - - - -	118-119
They do not commence at the "pushing of the ram"	- - - - -	119-120
The "ram," or Medo Persia, "became great" by "pushing," and not by "acts of kindness toward the Jews"	- - - - -	120-121
What do the 2300 days measure	- - - - -	121-122
The "daily sacrifice" and the "transgression of desolation"	- - - - -	122-123
The "seventy weeks" and the "going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem"	- - - - -	123-124
The meaning of the word "determined"	- - - - -	124-125
The "seventy" and the sixty-nine weeks both begin at the same time	- - - - -	125-126
The "sixty-nine" reach to the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ	- - - - -	126-127
The time when the "Messiah" became "the prince"	- - - - -	127-129
The "one week" of the confirming of the covenant	- - - - -	129-130
Cyrus represents a dynasty, or line of kings, and not an individual king, together with his decree	- - - - -	130-132
The decree of Cyrus wholly confined to the temple	- - - - -	132-134
The commandment given by Artaxerxes in his twentieth year the only one ever given to restore and to build Jerusalem	- - - - -	134-137
The true date of the crucifixion A. D. 37	- - - - -	137-140
The time of the restoration of the "daily sacrifice" and the commencement and termination of the 2300 days	- - - - -	140-144

☞ This pamphlet will be sent *free* (except the potsage, which is two cents each) to all who may desire it.

All orders should be addressed to

ELD. S. S. BREWER,
Newark, N. J.

THE HERALD OF THE BRIDEGROOM

AND

MORNING WATCH,

is published semi-monthly, at 151 Market st., Newark, N. J.

ELD. S. S. BREWER, Editor.

This paper is devoted to the consideration of the prophecies mainly relating to the second personal appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ, showing that it will take place no later than 1867. It is published by voluntary subscriptions. This paper should be taken by every one who feels an interest in this glorious subject, as additional evidences will be presented from time to time, in confirmation of the truths contained in this pamphlet; and also as a medium through which the Church scattered abroad may communicate with each other, and thus comfort and exhort one another to faithfulness and diligence in view of the coming of the Lord.

All orders and remittances for the paper or pamphlet should be addressed to Eld. S. S. Brewer, Newark, N. J.

CHAPTER I.

THE TIME TO BE UNDERSTOOD.

“But of that day and that hour knoweth no man. No, not the angels which are in heaven; neither the Son, but the Father.—Mark. xiii: 32.

This is probably one of the most familiar texts, with the great mass of the people, extant, and is used by them, to great advantage (as they suppose), to refute any arguments that are presented to show the close proximity of “that day” of which the Saviour speaks; and it is immaterial how strong the evidence may be, or how unmistakable the signs may appear, this text is considered sufficient proof of the utter impossibility of knowing anything about the time of our Saviour’s return.

Before attempting to disprove these conclusions, let us notice the reading of the text: “But of that day and that hour *knoweth no man*, &c. Mark this, for we sometimes hear it quoted thus: “of that day and hour *no man shall know*,” but it does not read so; and if it did, let us see how many parties would thereby be prohibited from knowing. There are three: Man, the Angels, and the Son of God himself. And who will take the position that Christ will not know the day or hour in which He will come, before it arrives? Yet one is as plainly prohibited as the other. The Saviour was consistent in all His sayings, and his words are in exact harmony with each other; therefore He would not have taught the impossibility of understanding the “times and seasons,” and, in the same chapter, directed our minds to *time*, and shown the danger of our being ignorant of His approach. Verse 14 reads thus: “But when ye shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not (let him that readeth understand);” and if we consult Daniel, upon this subject, he informs us that “from the time” this “abomination of desolation” stands up, to the time when he is to “stand in” his “lot” (by a resurrection), there should be 1335 days (years). See Ezek. iv: 6. Here the Lord directs our minds to the subject of *time*, and commands us to understand it, which, it is said, our text

prohibits us from doing. The Saviour then speaks of the different signs which were to precede His advent, among which are the darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars, &c. ; and then says (verse 28), "now learn a parable of the fig tree: when her branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye *know* that Summer is near: so ye, in like manner, when ye shall see these things come to pass, know that it is nigh, even at the door." Question: If it was not necessary for us to know that it was nigh, why were these signs given with the command (to those witnessing them) *to know*? Matt. xxiv: 36, is a parallel passage with our text: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." Verse 37: "But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. For, as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and *knew not* until the flood came and took them all away. So shall also the coming of the Son of Man be."

It is an old saying, that "to be forewarned is to be fore-armed;" and thus it proved in Noah's case. Noah was a preacher of righteousness, but his salvation depended upon his building the ark agreeably to divine direction.

What was it that the antediluvians "*knew not*?" They did not learn of the approaching flood, nor of the *time* of its occurrence, consequently built no ark: "the flood came" and they, being unprepared, were "swept away" by it. "So shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." Reasoning from analogy, we see that, as Noah and the antediluvians are set forth as the representatives of the two corresponding classes at the time of the advent, we are constrained to believe that the church, who are "alive and remain" at the coming of the Lord, will understand as definitely the time of that event as Noah and his family did the time of the flood.

Matt. xxiv: 40, 41. "Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left.

Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken, and the other left."

The objection may be raised, that should a knowledge of definite time obtain, there would none be found laboring in the field or at the mill at the time of the advent. This is true; but we conceive that this separation takes place anterior to the final scene. It is generally supposed that those that are "taken" are the righteous, but we believe this to be a mistake, which, we think, will appear from the reading of

some other texts bearing on the same point. In Luke xvii: 34-36, we read: "One will be taken and the other left, &c., or, as some translators render it, *"One will be seized, and the other will escape,"* which we conceive to be the true idea. In the latter clause of each of these three passages the Greek word *paralephthesetai*, rendered "taken," signifies "to take by force or treachery, to seize, get possession of." The word *aphethesetai*, rendered "left," means "to send forth, to discharge, to send away, to let go." Thus we see, that those who are "taken" are those who are "seized," to be destroyed, consequently the wicked, while those who are "left" are "let go" or "escape." This is further demonstrated by Luke xxi: 34-36: "And take heed to yourselves lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness, and cares of this life, and so that day come upon you unawares. For *as a snare* shall it come on all them that dwell on the face of the whole earth. Watch ye, therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to *escape* all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man." Here it is seen that those who are "left" (*aphethesetai*) *escape* all the evil consequences of "surfeiting and drunkenness," and "stand before the Son of Man."

The Syriac version makes this still plainer: "*Like a hunter's snare* it will spring upon all them that dwell upon the face of the whole land." They are "*taken*" in the *snare*, or *seized*. Thus the command to "watch and pray always that" we may be "accounted worthy to *escape*." Escape what? The snare most certainly. But we will adduce further proof that this "snare" encloses the wicked before the final scene. Matt. xiii: 30. "Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together FIRST the TARES, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn." The wheat "are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one." We see from this that the separation of the wheat and tares is effected before *the reapers* perform their work, else the wheat and tares would have *both* been "gathered into" the Lord's barn. Verse 49 is synonymous.

"So shall it be at the end of the world. The angels shall come forth, and *sever the wicked* from among the just." The wicked are "taken" "*from among the just*," to be bound in *bundles*, or, the "snare" is sprung upon them preparatory to destruction, just as the unwary bird is "taken" at a time when wholly unconscious of danger.

But let us see who were "*taken*" and "*left*" in Noah's time. Matt. xxiv : 38, 39. "For as in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until *the day* that Noah entered into the ark, and *knew not* until the flood came, and *took them all away* ; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." We know from this that all that knew not of the approaching deluge were "*taken*" away by it, consequently Noah and his family were the only ones who were "*left*." God revealed the day unto Noah *seven days* previous to the actual coming of the flood. All those to whom this was not revealed, "*knew not*," and were, consequently, destroyed. Now it follows, of course, that as their doom was unalterably sealed, at the time of the revelation of the day unto Noah, the final separation took place at this point of time. The Revelator speaks of a time when "he that is unjust, let him be unjust still ; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still ; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still ; and he that is holy, let him be holy still."—Rev. xxii : 11. This shows that a time will come when the fate of every man will be fixed forever ; and this is *before* the advent, for the next verse says : "*and behold I come quickly*," &c. This fixes this point beyond possibility of doubt.

Having now answered these objections satisfactorily, we trust to the reader, we shall now answer one more on this point before leaving it. After Jesus had uttered the three passages in Luke xvii, the disciples asked him "where" the one party should be "*taken*?" "And He said unto them, Wheresoever the body is, thither will the eagles be gathered together." Matt. reads, "Wheresoever the *carcass* is, there will the eagles be gathered together." Some think that this means "wheresoever Christ is, there will the saints be gathered together." We think this view incorrect, for Christ is nowhere represented in the Scriptures by a "*carcass*," as it can only be the fitting emblem of a lifeless, putrifying mass, whether it refer to the physical, moral or political world. Neither are the saints anywhere symbolized by eagles, as they are essentially a *bird of prey*. The prophet, in speaking of the destruction of the armies of the nations, says : "their slain also shall be cast out, and their stink shall come up out of their *carcasses*, and the mountains shall melt with their blood." Isaiah xxxiv : 1-3. Again, the word "*body*" cannot refer to Christ, as He is not the "*body*" of the church, but the *head* of the body, "*which is the church*." Therefore, to warrant such a construction as this, it should read, "*wheresoever the head is, thither shall*

the *body* be gathered." But as we have seen that those who were "*taken*" were to be destroyed, the objection falls to the ground.

Matt. 24 : 43, "But know this, that if the good man of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up." Does not this verse teach that, as the good man did not know, he did not watch, and consequently his house was broken up? and the Saviour says, "Therefore, be ye also ready." It is useless to say that this watching consists in being always in an expectant position; for we have no right to expect the Saviour until we see the signs that were to precede His coming. Verse 45 and onward : "Who, then, is a faithful and wise servant, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? Blessed is that servant whom his Lord, when He cometh, shall find so doing. * * * But, and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, my Lord delayeth his coming, * * * the Lord of that servant shall come in a *day* when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of." Here are *two classes* of servants brought to view, delivering *opposite* messages : and we know what that of the evil servant was— "My Lord delayeth His coming;" but the good servant was giving the household "meat in due season;" due season for what? for the *advent*, we answer; for, as the evil servant was saying, "My Lord delayeth," so the good servant *must* have been saying, "My Lord *is* coming;" and had time connected with his preaching also; for it is impossible to have a delay or tarry without definite time. Thus, we see that the Lord came upon the evil servant, in an hour that he "was not aware of." Why? because he said, "My Lord delayeth."

Now, what was true of the evil servant, could not possibly be true of the good servant; therefore, the Lord would not come upon the good servant unawares. This must be apparent to every one.

1st Thes. v : "But of the times and seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you. For yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them, * * * and they shall not escape. But ye, brethren, *are not in darkness* that that day should overtake you as a thief. Ye are all the children of the *light*, and the children of the day; we are not of the night, nor of darkness."

Here we see that the day of the Lord is to come upon a

certain class as a thief: and it is upon those who say "peace and safety," that "sudden destruction" cometh upon.

Please mark this: If this fact was more fully recognized by those who place our text between them and that knowledge, regarding prophecy, which alone can render them "*the children of the light*," there would be less of that readiness to shut the eye to the increasing light, crying, "No man knoweth the day or the hour."

"But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief;" for while it should come upon the world "as a snare," and its awful consequences overwhelm them, the Church of God is to occupy a far different position: they are not to be in darkness upon a subject of such magnitude, but are to stand with their "loins girt about with truth, like unto men that wait for their Lord." The "*children of the night*" are the only ones upon whom the Lord comes unawares; and this is in harmony with the declaration of the angel to Daniel: "Many shall be purified and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly; and *none of the wicked shall understand*; BUT THE WISE SHALL UNDERSTAND"—in the time of the end. Daniel xii: 10 Understand what? The oath of the angel regarding the time in answer to the question: "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders," which is the resurrection. See Daniel xii: 7-8. Daniel was then informed, that the words were "closed up and sealed till the time of the end." Thus it is seen, that this truth was reserved from all generations, *except the last one*. Therefore, if it is not understood by them, no one will be benefitted, and the prophecy would be useless. But the fact that the time is attested to, by the solemn oath of the angel, coupled with the declaration that "*the wise shall understand*," reveals the fact that this truth, kept concealed from all others, should be of the utmost importance to the generation for whom it was reserved; and that even "*the wise*" would need its sanctifying power in order to be "purified and made white."

They that were to understand are called *wise* before they understand, thus showing that it is the church: for the "fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."

Rev. iii: 3. "If, therefore, thou shalt not watch, I will come on thee as a thief, and thou shalt not know what hour I will come upon thee." Now, if a want of watchfulness should be the cause, and the Saviour's coming as a thief, the effect of that cause—and as an opposite cause will surely produce an opposite effect—let us reverse the sentiments, and it

will read as follows: "If, therefore, thou *shalt watch*, I will *not* come on thee as a thief, but thou *shalt* know what hour I will come upon thee."

Amos iii: 7. "Surely the Lord God will do nothing, but He revealeth his secret unto His servants, the prophets." And the Psalmist says: "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him." These are plain declarations that the Lord will bring no judgments, of whatever magnitude, upon the earth, without first warning its inhabitants; much less will He bring them into the scenes of the final reckoning day without giving a timely warning of its approach. Men are not, necessarily, "in darkness, that that day should overtake" them "as a thief," but are "willingly ignorant," having blinded their eyes to the "sure word of prophecy." We are told that Noah was a "preacher of righteousness," and, as such, he must have warned the antediluvians of the approaching deluge; in fact, the building of the ark was a powerful sermon of itself, "by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of the righteousness, which is by faith."—Heb. xi: 7.

But his admonition fell upon their ears like dew drops upon the blades of grass, soon to be forgotten; for we read that they "knew not until the day that Noah entered into the ark." Rain was unknown previous to the flood, therefore, the antediluvians would not believe that a flood of waters was upon them, although the message came from God. So, likewise, this generation, while it has been warned by the prophetic word—by the darkening of the sun and moon, the falling of the stars, and by unmistakable signs in the Religious, Moral, Natural and Political elements—of the close proximity of "the great day of God Almighty," is still scoffing and saying, "Where is the promise of His (Christ's) coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation."—2d Peter ii: 3, 4.

It is said the world is yet in its infancy; if so, it must have been *extremely* young when God drowned it with a flood. And if, with all its blasphemy, carnage and sorrow, it is but an infant, we ask, with reverence, "what will it be in its *old age*?" Oh, wordling, heed not these lullabies to rock you to sleep, while you are trembling upon the brink of eternal ruin. But to return.

It will be seen that the numerous passages we have produced, from the inspired volume, are all found to be in conflict with our text, *if* it is to be understood to teach (as it is

said it does) the impossibility of understanding "the times and seasons." We shall now proceed, by the help of the Lord, to *harmonize* these seeming confliotions, and give what we believe to be a scriptural and, therefore, a correct exposition of it:

"Of that day and that hour knoweth no man," &c. This language was uttered over 1800 years ago, and was spoken in the present tense. The Saviour declared that He did not know, and that there was but one that did at that time—His Father. Christ had "not yet ascended to" His Father; and as the Father was the only one possessing that knowledge, it became as necessary that He (Christ) should "go to the Father," in order to receive that knowledge, as it was that He should "go away" that the comforter" might be given. The Saviour says: "If I go not away, the comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you." John xvi: 7. How was this to be effected? Hark! "For I will *pray the Father*, and He shall give you another comforter."—John xiv: 16.

This brings us to notice *one* of the offices of that comforter. John xvi: 12-15: "I have yet *many things* to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them *now*. Howbeit, when He, the spirit of truth is come, He will *guide you into all truth*: for He shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever He shall hear, that shall He speak; and He will show you things to come. He shall glorify me: for He shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you. All things that the Father hath *are mine*: therefore, said I, that He shall take of mine, and shall *show it unto you*."

Here it is positively stated, that "all things that the Father hath, are" Christ's; consequently, the Saviour must necessarily come into possession of the knowledge, concerning "the day and hour," on His ascent to heaven; and, as the Holy Ghost was "to receive of" Christ's, and "show it unto" the disciples, and show them "*all things*," they must, of course, come into possession of the knowledge concerning the "times and seasons."

The Saviour tells them, plainly, that He had "yet *many things* to say unto" them, but they could not "bear [understand] them" at that time, but comforts them with the assurance that they should not only have a teacher that should "bring to mind whatsoever things" He *had* spoken unto them, but should also endow them "with power from on high," and "show" them "*things to come*."

This is in perfect harmony with Acts i: 6-8, where this

question was propounded to Jesus: "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel? And He said unto them, It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in His own power; but ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you." We see here the reason why the Saviour knew not the "day or the hour." Now, if Christ *had known* it, He would have revealed it to His disciples, for He says (John xv: 15): "I have called you friends; for *all things* that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you;" plainly showing that He had *not yet* received a revelation of time.

But if He kept no knowledge from His disciples, when on earth, it is not to be supposed that He acted on a different principle after His ascension; and that He does not, is evident from His language—"He, the spirit of truth, shall *take of mine* and show it unto you," and "show you things to come." To what extent will this knowledge be given? "All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore, said I, that He shall take of mine and shall show it unto you." Thus the Holy Ghost was to come into possession of "all things that the Father hath:" and "whatsoever He shall *hear* that shall He *speak*."

The disciples were anxious to know if Christ would, at that time, "restore the kingdom to Israel." They were in doubt about it, for He had told them He was going away, which they did not seem to fully comprehend. The Saviour does not answer their inquiry directly, gives His reason, and then applies the same comforting promise in different language, which we have quoted from John, viz.: that, through the influence of the Holy Ghost, they should "receive *power*:" and this power embraces the knowledge they desired of Him, from the fact that it was promised in answer to their question regarding time.

The difficulty may arise in the minds of some that, as the word "power" in Acts i: 8, is translated from the Greek word "*dunamin*," it merely signifies *energy* to perform what Jesus said they should, viz.: to be witnesses unto Him, &c.; not *energy* to comprehend times and seasons. But by a reference to Liddle & Scott's Greek and English Lexicon, it will be seen that the word, *dunamin*, means "in *general power, force, ability; especially, force of MIND, power, ability*," and *consequently knowledge*; for it is simply impossible to confer "force of mind, power, ability," upon an individual, without conferring *knowledge*; and this is further shown, from the fact, that this "*power, force of mind*," &c., was to

be received through the agency of the Holy Ghost, which, when it should be given, should speak "whatsoever He shall hear;" guide them "into all truth," and show them things to come." Thus we see that the same knowledge that the Father put in his own power (*Exousia*) was to be given through the Holy Spirit. The word *Exousia* (translated *power*), in the 7th verse, according to Liddle & Scott, signifies "*power, means, authority.*" Here we see *two distinct words* translated *power*; one meaning "*power, means, authority,*" the other, "*force of mind, power, ability.*" It would seem from this, that the true meaning of this text is this: "It is not for you to know the times and seasons which the Father hath put in His own power (*Exousia*) now, but ye shall receive wisdom or knowledge (*dunamin*), after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you," or through "the *power* of the Holy Ghost *coming upon you,*" as it reads in the margin. Thus it is shown that Acts i: 7-8, instead of being *opposed to*, is *conclusively evidence in favor of*, an understanding of the "times and seasons."

To further prove that the power, here spoken of, was to be a prophetic power, listen to Peter, while he quotes from Joel: Acts ii: 16-20: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass, in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of *my spirit* upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall *prophecy*, * * * and on my servants, and on my handmaidens, I will pour out in those days, of my spirit; and *they shall prophecy*: and I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood, and fire, and pillar of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come."

Thus it is seen that *prophetic power* was to be given, and, in connection with the signs, was to be "like unto a lamp that shineth in a dark place until the day dawn."—2d Peter i: 19. Do not understand us to say that a knowledge of the *literal day and hour* was given on the day of Pentecost, for, if it had, it would not have been in harmony with the declaration of the angel to Daniel: "shut up the words and seal the book, even to the *time of the end*: many shall run to and fro and *knowledge shall be increased.*"—Daniel xii: 4. Neither could it have been "as it was in the days of Noah;" he knew the *year* 120 years in advance, but was ignorant of the day until *one week* previous, when that also was revealed to him.

"The day" or "the hour," in the Scriptures, are not gene-

rally to be understood literally; for instance, "*now is the day of salvation*"—which includes the whole gospel dispensation; "*mine hour is not yet come,*" which signifies "*my time,*" &c. Sufficient prophetic power was given to the apostles to enable them to look down through centuries, and speak with accuracy of events transpiring before *our* eyes. Thus we hear Paul speaking of the "falling away" (apostacy), and the "man of sin" that should be revealed before the Lord came (See 2d Thes. ii: 3); also, of a class that was to "*see the day approaching* (Heb. x: 25), which could not have been the generation *then* living, but must refer to the one living "in the time of the end" (a period of 75 years, according to expositors), after the sun and moon were darkened, during which period the seals were to be removed from Daniel's prophecy and knowledge be increased.

The Saviour's words are also in harmony with this; for after speaking of the signs in the sun and moon, &c., He says (Mark xiii: 30): "Verily, I say unto you, that this generation [witnessing these signs] shall not pass till *all* these things be *done*"—including His second coming, which is still future.

The truths of the prophetic word have been unfolded to the church, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, in installments, as it became "*due*" to her; and always at the proper time, and adapted to the circumstances in which she was placed.

The dispensational truth of Noah's day would have been of no value to Lot, and *vice versa*. Thus the truth peculiarly adapted to the wants of the church in the last generation, was wisely hid from all preceding ones, to become the "*meat in due season,*" which the "faithful and wise servant" should be feeding to the "household of faith" just prior to the advent of our blessed Lord.

We have seen that prophetic power *was to be*, and *was*, given on the day of Pentecost; which could not have been given had Christ remained on the earth. But this was not all; it would seem that Divine Wisdom did not consider this enough. We see another effect of the Saviour's ascension, in unfolding the mysteries of the future, in a *direct revelation* which He received from His Father, which is a revelation of the *events and the time* connected with those events, from that period on to the second advent, and beyond it. Did Christ withhold it from the church? Oh, no; that would be unlike the blessed Saviour, to leave His church in utter darkness concerning the trials through which she was to pass and the duration of them. Hark! "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto Him, to show unto His servants things

which must shortly come to pass; and He sent and signified it by His angel unto His servant John: who bare record of the word of God, and of the testimony of Jesus Christ, and of all things that He saw. Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and *keep* those things which are written therein, for *the time* is at hand.—Rev. i: 1-3.

The Saviour not only communicates with His servants by the whisperings of His Spirit, but He has also sent *a letter*, containing the most valuable information, the seal of which was not to remain unbroken; for we read thus: "*Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book, for the time is at hand.*"—Rev. xxii; 10. Therefore, we are not only *privileged* to read it, but a blessing is pronounced on such and *such only* as do.

Now, there could be no blessing or benefit accruing to any one, from simply reading or hearing this revelation, except they understood it; "for He that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God; for *no man* understandeth Him."—1st Cor. xiv: 2.

The revelation was given in symbolic language, designedly (it would seem), that none—except those who would study it carefully and prayerfully, might comprehend it; and it is only through a lack of investigation that it is not more universally understood at the present time; but it was to be understood by "the wise" previous to the end, otherwise it would be valueless as a revelation, the meaning of which is to *reveal*.

In conclusion, we would ask, in all candor, "if Jesus taught in our text that the times and seasons would never be understood, *why* was the Revelation given?" With God there is neither "variableness nor shadow of turning;" His plans are the "same yesterday, to-day and forever;" He has pronounced a blessing on such as should "dig for" truth "as for hid treasures;" and if Christ intended to teach that we should be ignorant of His approach when He uttered our text, He retains the same intention to-day; consequently, the Revelation would *never have been given*. O, then, if the antediluvians were destroyed because they "*knew not*," and the Jewish nation desolated "*because*" they "*knew not the time of*" their "visitation," think not that this generation—that has been warned by celestial and terrestrial signs, the prophetic word, and the heralds of the cross of the approaching judgment—will not be held responsible by the same God. O, then, if you have never given "the sure word of prophecy" your at-

tention, begin without delay to "give heed" unto it, and "add to your *faith* KNOWLEDGE."—2d Peter i: 5. Be "like unto them that *wait* for their Lord; not like "the good man" whose house was broken up." Heed the Saviour's admonition, "let your loins be girded about" with truth, "and your *lights burning*."

Having proved, we trust, to the satisfaction of the reader, that *time* is a portion, not only of the old testament, but of the gospel of Christ also; and as past disappointments are frequently urged as an argument against a correct understanding of the "times and seasons," we will now refer the reader to an article, in another portion of this work, entitled, "The Four Watches," which, we think, will be satisfactory on this point, also.

CHAPTER II.

EXPOSITION OF THE GREAT RED DRAGON.

Rev. xii: 3. "And there appeared another wonder in heaven: and behold a great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his heads."

That the "dragon" here is a symbol, is not only generally admitted by expositors, but it is clearly proved from all the facts and circumstances in the case. 1. It has "seven heads and ten horns." 2. "His tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven." 3. He casts "out of his mouth waters as a flood after the woman," which (waters) are interpreted to mean "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." As all this could not be affirmed of the literal devil, therefore it is a symbol, and as such, symbolizes the pagan Roman empire, since the Roman empire was, at the time John obtained the Revelation, the universal monarchy in the world.

As it may be interesting to the reader to know why the Roman empire was symbolized by "a great red dragon" rather than by any other symbol, we subjoin the following from Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary, which is not only a clear explanation of this point, but is also an additional proof of the correctness of the application of the symbol:

"The dragon here is a symbol, not of the *Roman empire* in general, but of the *HEATHEN Roman empire* in particular. This great pagan power must, therefore, have been thus represented from the religion which it supported. But what is a dragon? An entirely fabulous beast of antiquity, consequently, in this respect, a most proper emblem of the heathen worship, which consisted in paying adoration to numerous imaginary beings, termed gods, goddesses, &c. The very foundation of the heathen religious system is mostly built upon fable; and it is very difficult to trace many of their superstitions to any authentic original; and even those which appear to derive their origin from the sacred writings are so disguised in fable as literally to bear no more resemblance to the truth than the dragon of the ancients does to any animal with which we are acquainted. But it may be asked why the spirit of God should

represent the *heathen* Roman empire by a *dragon*, rather than by any other of the fabulous animals with which the mythology of the ancient Romans abounded. The answer is as follows: "In the eighth chapter of the Prophet Daniel, God has represented the kingdom of the Greeks by a *he-goat*, for no other apparent reason than this, that it was the national military standard of the Grecian monarchy; we may therefore expect that the pagan Roman empire is called A DRAGON on a similar account. In confirmation of this point, it is very remarkable that the *dragon* was the principal standard of the Romans next to the eagle, in the *second, third, fourth, and fifth* centuries of the Christian era. Of this we have abundant evidence in the writings of both heathens and Christians. Arrian is the earliest writer who has mentioned that dragons were used as military standards among the Romans. See his *Tactics*, c. 51. Hence Schwebelius supposes that this standard was introduced after Trajan's conquest of the Daci. See *Vegetius de Re Militari* a Schwebelio, p. 191, Argentorati, 1806; and *Grævii Thesaur., Antiq. Roman.*, tom. x, col. 1529. Vegetius, who flourished about A. D. 386, says, lib. ii, c. 13: *Primum signum totius legionis est aquila, quam aquilifer portat. DRACONES etiam per singulas cohortes a draconariis ferunter ad prælium.* "The first standard of the whole legion is the eagle, which the aquilifer carries. Dragons are also borne to battle by the draconarii." As a legion consisted of ten cohorts, there were therefore *ten* draconarii to *one* aquilifer; hence, from the great number of draconarii in an army, the word *signarii* or *signiferi*, standard bearers, came at last to mean the carriers of the dragon standards only, the others retaining the name of *aquiliferi*.—See *Veget.*, lib. ii, c. 7, and his commentators.

"The heathen Roman empire is called a RED *dragon*; and accordingly we find from the testimony of ancient writers that the dragon standards of the Romans were painted *red*. We read in Ammianus Marcellinus, lib. xvi, c. 12, of PURPUREUM *signum draconis*, "the purple standard of the dragon." See also *Claudianus* in *Rufinum*, lib. ii, l. 177, 178. *Pitiscus*, in his *Lexicon Antiq. Rom.*, and *Ducange*, in his *Glossarium Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis*, sub. voc. *Draco*, have considered this subject at great length, especially the latter writer, who has made several quotations from *Claudianus*, *Sidonius*, *Prudentius*, and others, in which not only the standard, but also the image of the dragon itself, is stated to be of a *red* or *purple* color. Of what has been said above, respecting the dragon, this is the sum: a *huge fabulous beast* is shown to St.

John, by which some GREAT PAGAN power is symbolically represented; and the RED dragon is selected from among the numerous imaginary animals which the fancies of mankind have created, to show that this great pagan power is the HEATHEN ROMAN empire."

Having thus shown that the dragon represents the Pagan Roman Empire, we shall next consider the

"Seven heads and ten horns." The seven heads have generally been understood to be the seven forms of government, as follows: 1. The regal powers; 2. The consulate; 3. The dictatorship; 4. The decemvirate; 5. The consular power; 6. The triumvirate; and, 7. The imperial government. This view is evidently correct, from the fact that the crowns are on the heads and not on the horns. The ten divisions of the empire are represented by the ten horns without crowns, from the fact that none of them succeeded to, or wore the legitimate Iron Crown of the Cæsars; and therefore, as none of them ever wore the legitimate crown of the empire, they are represented without crowns. The crowns were, therefore, on the seven heads.

The "ten horns" are understood very nearly alike by the different expositors, and are as follows: 1. The Vandals, A. D. 439; 2. The Huns, 445; 3. The Ostrogoths, 377; 4. The Visigoths, 378; 5. The Franks, 407; 6. The Suevi, 409; 7. The Burgundians, 407; 8. The Saxons, 455; 9. The Britons, 409; and 10. The Alemani, about 400. Thus, between 377 and 455, we have the Roman empire divided into ten kingdoms, as represented by the ten horns.

Verse 4. "*And his tail drew the third part of the stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth.*"

By the "tail," as Dr. Clarke clearly shows, is meant the seventh or last form of the Roman government.

"Stars" are shown to represent ministers of religion; hence the "seven stars" are explained to be the "seven angels," or ministers of the "seven churches." The resemblance of ministers to "stars" is very striking; for, as stars give light upon the earth, so are ministers the light of the cause they advocate; and their position in heaven, the symbol of dominion, very fitly betoken the spiritual authority of priests or ministers over their flocks. Hence the "woman," or Christian Church, has a "crown of twelve stars upon her head," which signifies the twelve apostles, who are the twelve principal lights of the Christian world.

The religious world, in the time of St. John, or the seventh head of the Roman empire, was divided into three grand di-

visions, viz: "The Christian world, the Jewish world, and the Heathen or Pagan world." That the ministers of the Jewish world is here meant by the third part of the stars of heaven, is very evident, from the fact that it was them that were overthrown or "cast to the earth," as it were, during the existence of this seventh or last head of the dragon empire. As the overthrow of the entire Jewish system of worship at this time is so well known, we need not therefore enlarge any further on this point.

Verse 7. "*And there was war in heaven. Michael and his angels fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought and his angels.*"

This evidently had its fulfillment in the great conflict between the ministers of Christ, on the one hand, and the Roman emperors and their ministers on the other, from the beginning of the reign of Nero, A. D. 64, to the conversion of Constantine the great, at the beginning of the fourth century, embracing what is generally known as the "ten persecutions."

Verse 8. "*And prevailed not.*"

At the conversion of Constantine the great, the ministers of the Christian Church gained a complete triumph over the pagan priests.

"*Neither was their place found any more in heaven.*"

That is, "The advocates of the heathen idolatry were no longer permitted to have any further share in the government of the empire," which was true soon after the conversion of Constantine.

Verse 9. "*And the great dragon was cast out,*" &c.

The following from Dr. Clarke's Commentary accords perfectly with our views, and shows clearly the fulfillment of this verse: "By the terms *Devil* and *Satan*, mentioned in this verse, Pareus, Faber, and many other commentators, understand literally the great spiritual enemy of mankind. But this view of the passage cannot be correct, from the circumstance that it is the *dragon* which is thus called. Now, if by the *dragon* be meant the *devil*, then we are necessarily led to the conclusion, that the great apostate spirit is a *monster*, having seven heads and ten horns; and also that he has a *tail*, with which he drags after him the third part of the stars of heaven. The appellations, *old serpent*, *devil*, and *satan*, must, therefore, be understood figuratively. The heathen power is called *that old serpent which deceiveth the whole world*, from its subtlety against the Christians, and its causing the whole Roman world, as far as it was in its power, to embrace the absurdities of paganism. It is called the *devil*,

from its continual false accusations and slanders against the true worshippers of God, for the devil is *a liar from the beginning*; and it is also called *Satan*, from a Hebrew word signifying *an adversary*, from its frequent persecution of the Christian Church. The dragon and his angels are said to be *cast out*, which is more than was said in the preceding verse. There, mention is made of his being found no longer in *heaven*, or on the throne of the Roman empire; here he is entirely cast out from all offices of trust in the empire. His religion is at first only tolerated, and then totally abolished, by the imperial power. This great event was not the work of a reign; it took up many years, for it had to contend with the deep-rooted prejudices of the heathen, who to the very last endeavored to uphold their declining superstition. Paganism received several mortal strokes in the time of Constantine and his sons Constans and Constantius. It was further reduced by the great zeal of Jovian, Valentinian, and Valens; and was finally suppressed by the edicts of Gratian, Theodosius I, and his successors. It was not till A. D. 388 that Rome itself, the residence of the emperor, was generally reformed from the absurdities of paganism; but the total suppression of paganism soon followed the conversion of the metropolitan city, and about A. D. 395 the dragon may be considered, in an eminent sense, to have been cast into the earth, that is, into a state of utter subjection to the ruling dynasty of Christian emperors."

Verse 19. "*And I heard a loud voice,*" &c.

This is a song of triumph of the Christian Church over the heathen idolatry, and is very expressive of the great joy of the Christians upon this most stupendous event.

Verse 15. "*And the serpent cast out of his mouth water as a flood after the woman,*" &c.

As the explanation of this verse will also clearly explain verses 12 and 17, we therefore, for the sake of brevity, omit any direct explanation of them. The following, also, from Dr. Clarke, shows clearly the fulfillment of this verse:

"Dr. Mosheim, in the commencement of his second chapter upon the fifth century, observes "that the Goths, the Heruli, the Franks, the Huns, and the Vandals, with other fierce and warlike nations, for the most part strangers to Christianity, had invaded the Roman empire, and rent it asunder in the most deplorable manner. Amidst these calamities the Christians were grievous—nay, we may venture to say, the principal sufferers. It is true these savage nations were much more intent upon the acquisition of wealth and domin-

ion than upon the propagation or support of the pagan superstition. Nor did their cruelty and opposition to the Christians arise from any religious principle, or from an enthusiastic desire to ruin the cause of Christianity; it was merely by the instigation of the pagans, who remained yet in the empire, that they were excited to treat with such severity and violence the followers of Christ."

Thus the woe which was denounced, verse 12, against the inhabitants of the earth and of the sea, came upon the whole Roman world; for, in consequence of the excitement and malicious misrepresentations of the pagans of the empire, "a transmigration of a great swarm of nations" came upon the Romans, and ceased not their ravages till they had desolated the eastern empire, even as far as the gates of Byzantium, and finally possessed themselves of the western empire. "If," says Dr. Robertson, in the introduction to his History of Charles V, vol. i, pp. 11, 12, edit. Lond. 1809, "a man was called to fix upon the period in the history of the world, during which the condition of the human race was most calamitous and afflicted, he would, without hesitation, name that which elapsed from the death of Theodosius the Great to the establishment of the Lombards in Italy, a period of one hundred and seventy-six years. The contemporary authors, who beheld that scene of desolation, labor and are at a loss for expressions to describe the horrors of it. The scourge of God, the destroyer of nations, are the dreadful epithets by which they distinguish the most noted of the barbarous leaders; and they compare the ruin which they had brought on the world to the havoc occasioned by earthquakes, conflagrations, or deluges, the most formidable and fatal calamities which the imagination of man can conceive." But the subtle design which the serpent or dragon had in view, when he vomited out of his mouth a flood of waters, was most providentially frustrated."

Thus it is shown how effectual the pagans, in the empire, were in instigating those barbarian nations against the Church. The extract from Dr. Mosheim, as quoted by Dr. Clarke, also shows the great wrath of the pagan worshippers, as brought to view in the 12th verse, and his persecutions of the Church, in the 13th verse. The pagan worshippers saw very clearly, from the rapidity of the increase of the professed Christian Church, that their time was very short, and therefore manifested the greater wrath.

Having thus shown that the dragon symbolized the Roman empire in the west, it will be seen that this symbol could not

possibly apply to the Greek empire, from the consideration that that empire never supported the dragon or pagan religion and worship, and was never divided into ten divisions or kingdoms. We wish the reader to take particular notice of these facts, as they will be of much importance in our future investigations.

Having now finished this part of the investigation, for the present at least, we shall therefore in the next chapter proceed to the investigation of the prophetic history of the "beast like unto a leopard," to which we call the earnest attention of the reader.

CHAPTER III.

EXPOSITION OF THE BEAST "LIKE UNTO A LEOPARD" OF
REVELATION, CHAPTER XIII.

Verse 1. "And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy."

Verse 2. "And the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard, and his feet were as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion; and the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority."

Verse 5. "And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to make war forty and two months."

Verse 7. "And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues, and nations."

This beast, together with the mouth given to him, as stated in the 5th verse, is generally understood to represent a union of civil and ecclesiastical power, and as such, to represent the papacy. That it represents a union of civil and ecclesiastical power we readily admit; but that it symbolizes simply the papacy, we object—

First: Because it cannot be said that any of the "ten kingdoms," into which the "dragon" or Roman empire was divided, ever gave the papacy "his power, and his seat, and great authority." We make this statement without fear of successful contradiction. All expositors, as we remarked in the former chapter, are nearly agreed as to the ten kingdoms. The Roman empire, in the west, which is the *only* empire that ever was divided into ten kingdoms was *wholly* overthrown and thus divided, as we have shown in the former chapter, by A. D. 476. (Further particulars on this point, however, will be given at a future period in our investigations.) As, therefore, none of those divisions ever gave him (the papacy) "his power, and his seat, and great authority," the papacy cannot be the power symbolized by the "beast." It is claimed that

this gift of "power," "seat and great authority," was bestowed on the Popes of Rome by the Greek government; but we object, that the Greek government was not one of the ten kingdoms, nor the empire that was thus divided; and further, the Greek government was not symbolized by the dragon, not only from the facts already stated, but from the consideration that the Greek government was not a supporter of the dragon or pagan religion and worship. Indeed, every particular in the symbol and prophecy show that the "dragon," with his "seven heads and ten horns," belonged wholly to the pagan Roman empire in the west, as we have clearly proved in the preceding chapter.

Second: That the above SEVEN-HEADED monster does not symbolize the Popedom is evident from the fact that the Popes of Rome have invariably boasted of their *Apostolic succession*. They admit of *no change* in their boasted infallibility, from the first of their predecessors down to the present time; they have been, and have ever claimed to be, *one unbroken* chain throughout. As, therefore, the papacy cannot be divided into seven different kingdoms, as represented by the seven heads of the beast, which were to rise and fall in a consecutive order (chapter xvii: 10), it proves positively that the papacy cannot be meant.

Third: The beast, according to the law of symbols, can only represent an independent universal imperial power. This is proved by the prophecy of Daniel, where we have the symbol of a *beast* explained. Also, in the 7th verse of the chapter under consideration it reads: "And power was given him over all kindreds, and tongues and nations." This shows that the beast under consideration represents a universal imperial power, and, therefore, cannot apply to the papacy. All the power that the papacy had was obtained from a higher power. Nor was the papacy a civil power in any sense prior to 755, which is from 150 to 200 years later than any Protestant commentator has dated the rise of the beast, or that its rise can be dated consistently with the facts in the case, as we shall prove. Having proved that the papacy is not the power intended by the beast, there is but one other power, that has ever arisen in the world, to which it can apply, and that is to the Greek empire, which arose out of the eastern province of, and succeeded to, the dominion of the Roman empire in 476. We will now proceed to show the rise of this power as declared by the Revelator in the 2d verse, thus: "And the dragon gave him his power, and his seat, and great authority."

The following extract from Gibbon, vol. 3, p. 512, will

show the fulfillment of this part of the prophecy, in a most clear and striking manner:

"The unfortunate Augustulus [the last Roman emperor] was made the instrument of his own disgrace. He signified his resignation to the Senate, and that assembly, in their last act of obedience to a Roman prince, still affected the spirit of freedom, and the forms of the constitution. An epistle was addressed by their unanimous decree to the Emperor Zeno, the son-in-law and successor of Leo, who had lately been restored, after a short rebellion, to the Byzantine throne. They solemnly "disclaim the necessity, or even the wish, of continuing the imperial succession in Italy, since, in their opinion, the majesty of a sole monarch is sufficient to pervade and protect at the same time both the East and the West. In their own name and in the name of the people they consent that the SEAT OF THE UNIVERSAL EMPIRE shall be transferred from Rome to Constantinople; and they basely renounced the right of choosing their own master, the *only vestige* that yet remained of the authority which had given law to the world."

* * * "His (Zeno's) vanity was gratified by the title of sole Emperor, and by the statues erected to his honor in the several quarters of Rome; and he gratefully accepted the imperial ensign, the sacred ornaments of the throne and palace, which the barbarians were not unwilling to remove from the sight of the people."

Thus, the seven-headed, dragonic power, symbolizing the Roman empire proper, transferred his power, seat and great authority to Zeno, emperor of the Greek empire, symbolized by the beast "like unto a leopard."

This is one of the most remarkable occurrences in history, that a universal empire, like that of Rome, should, by its own voluntary act, give its power, seat and great authority to a rival government. Thus the Greek empire came to the dominion, not by conquest, but by a voluntary gift, according to the prophecy. From 476, therefore, the Greek empire became the universal empire of the world, instead of the Roman empire in the west, upon the same principle that the four empires succeeded each other in the prophecy of Daniel. From all these facts, we conceive it to be utterly impossible that we can be mistaken in the rise of the leopard beast empire. If further evidence should be required, by the reader, in proof of the correctness of our position here, it is found in the fact that it was, as we shall have occasion to show, the Greek emperors that promulgated and established the laws by which over fifty millions of the saints were put to death.

Indeed, it is an admitted fact that the Greek emperor, Justinian, did make war on the saints; and as the first imperial edict, to persecute with "FIRE AND SWORD" in defence of Roman Catholicism, was issued by the above monarch, two fundamental points are established, first: The Greek empire was the first war making power; and, second, the forty-two months commenced under the administration of Justinian, of which period we shall speak hereafter. Having now shown, as we trust, to the satisfaction of the reader, that the Greek empire constituted the first head of the beast, we shall, in the next place, proceed to show by historical facts that the Pope of Rome separated from the Greek empire and formed an alliance with

THE SECOND HEAD—FRANCE.

Putnam, in his history of "The World's Progress," page 74, states, that in the year 800 "the Pope separates from the Eastern Empire and becomes supreme bishop of the Western." On the same page he further states—"New Empire of the West, founded by Charlemagne, who is crowned at Rome, by the Pope, King of Italy, Germany and France."

In addition to the above, please notice the following testimony from "Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," vol. 5, pp. 40-43:

"It was after the Nicene Synod, and under the reign of the pious Irene, that the Popes consulted the separation of Rome and Italy by the translation of the empire to the less orthodox Charlemagne. By this decisive measure they would finally eradicate the claims of the Greeks. The majesty of Rome would be restored; the Latin churches or Christians would be united under a SUPREME HEAD in their ancient metropolis; and the conquerors of the West would receive their crown from the successors of St. Peter. The Roman Church would acquire a zealous and respectable advocate. UNDER THE SHADOW OF THE CARLOVINGIAN POWER, THE BISHOP MIGHT EXERCISE WITH HONOR AND SAFETY THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CITY."

"On the festival of Christmas, the last year of the eighth century, Charlemagne appeared in the church of St. Peter, and to gratify the vanity of Rome, he had exchanged the simple dress of his country for the habit of a patrician. After the celebration of the holy mysteries, Leo suddenly placed a precious crown on his head, and the dome resounded with the acclamations of the people, 'long life and victory to Charles, the most pious Augustus, CROWNED BY GOD, the great and

pacific EMPEROR OF THE ROMANS!" The head and body of Charlemagne were consecrated by the royal unction, after the example of the Cæsars; he was saluted or adored by the pontiff; his coronation represents a promise to maintain the faith and the privileges of the Church."

The above testimony is quite sufficient, we think, to prove that France was the SECOND HEAD of the "LEOPARD BEAST." A. B. Edwards, in his "History of France" (Lon. Ed.), speaking of Charlemagne's war upon the Saxon's in favor of the Catholic church, states:

"Year after year he wasted their country by fire and sword, overthrew their idols, levelled their temples to the ground, erected fortresses amid the ruins of their villages, and carried away vast numbers of captives to the interior of Gaul. To this forced emigration succeeded unwelcome thousands of reluctant Saxons, who were compelled to subscribe to the ceremony of baptism."

Charlemagne died Jan. 8th, 813; he was succeeded by his son, Louis I, and this line of kings terminated with the deposition of "Charles the Fat" "in a diet." Gibbon states, vol. 5, p. 55: "The whole term of seventy-four years may be deemed a vacancy from the abdication of Charles the Fat to the ESTABLISHMENT OF OTHO THE FIRST." Please mark the above testimony. Thus, dear reader, France became the second head and war-making power of "THE LEOPARD BEAST."

THE THIRD HEAD

is beyond doubt the Saxons, commencing with Otho the First, concerning whom we give the following extract of history:

"Otho was of a noble race of dukes of Saxony. His father, Henry the Fowler, was elected by the suffrage of the nation to save and institute the kingdom of Germany. Its limits were enlarged on every side by his son, the first and greatest of the Othos. * * * In the North, Christianity was propagated by the sword. * * * At the head of a victorious army he passed the Alps, subdued the kingdom of Italy, delivered the Pope, and forever fixed the imperial crown in the name and nation of Germany. From that time or memorable era, two maxims of public jurisprudence were introduced by force, and ratified by time.

First—That the prince who was elected in the German diet acquired, from that instant, the subject kingdoms of Italy and Rome.

Second—But that he might not legally assume the title of

Emperor and Augustus, till he had received the crown from the hands of the Roman pontiff.—Gibbon, vol. 5, p. 55.

No fact in history stands forth in clearer light than that the Saxons were the third head of the Beast like a leopard.

The following is an extract from Prof. Kohlrush's celebrated history of Germany, pp. 122, 123 :

"Before the death of Henry, the princes had promised him to recognise his son Otho, as his successor to the empire, and this recognition was now confirmed by a great assembly at Aix-la-Chapelle, where Otho was solemnly crowned. * * * When the people were assembled in the grand cathedral of Aix-la-Chapelle, the archbishop led the young king forward by the hand, and thus spoke to the multitude: 'Behold, I here present to you the king, Otho, *elected by God*, proposed by king Henry, and nominated by all the princes! If this choice be acceptable to you, you will signify it by raising your right hand towards heaven!'

"The whole multitude then held up their hands and hailed the new king with loud and joyful acclamations. The archbishop then stepped with him to the altar whereupon the imperial insignia lay—the sword and belt, the imperial mantle, the armlets and the staff, together with the sceptre and the crown. The sword he handed to him with these words: 'Take this sword destined to repulse all the enemies of Christ, and to confirm, with most lasting power, the peace of all Christians;' and he handed to his majesty the other articles, with a similar address. He then placed the crown upon his head and led him to the throne. He was a great and powerful monarch, and was soon considered the first prince in Christendom. He had placed upon his head the imperial crown of Charlemagne.

"Otho, the first and greatest of the Othos, died at Castle Mamleben, on the 7th of May, 973, aged 61 years, and in the thirty-eighth of his reign, and was succeeded by his son, Otho II, who died in the presence of his Queen, the Pope, and several of his faithful adherents, on the 7th of December, 983, in the twenty eighth year of his age. He was buried in the Church of St. Peter, in Rome.

"The news of his death reached Aix-la-Chapelle the day after the coronation of his infant son had been celebrated in the assembly of all the princes.

"When the youthful monarch had attained his sixteenth year, his grandmother, Queen Adelaide, expressed a desire to behold the head of her grandson likewise decorated with the imperial crown. Accordingly, in February, 996, he com-

menced his first Roman expedition, and all the nations of the Germans, Saxons, Franks, Bavarians, Swabians and Lorrains, yielded on this occasion military service, and joined in the ranks of the multitudinous train. He was crowned Emperor on Ascension Day, the 21st of May, in that year, by Pope Gregory V."

Otho III died on the 23d of January, 1002, at Paterno, in the twenty-second year of his age. Speaking of the unexpected death of Otho III, Hallam, in his *History of the Middle Ages*, page 228, remarks:

"Upon the immature and unexpected decease of Otho III, a momentary opposition was offered to Henry, Duke of Bavaria, a collateral branch of the reigning family. He obtained the crown, however, by what contemporary historians call an hereditary title, and it was not until his death, in 1024, that the house of Saxony was deemed to be extinct."

Having traced the inauguration, succession and departure of the Saxon or third head and war making power, we now proceed to investigate, in as brief a manner as possible, the imperial succession and war making power of

THE FOURTH HEAD—THE HOUSE OF FRANCONIA.

In reference to the House of Franconia, Professor Kohlraush, in his *History of Germany*, remarks:

"The Germanic states, each under its duke, assembled for the election of a new emperor, upon the vast plains along both banks of the Rhine, between Mentz and Worms, near Oppenheim. * * * A splendid and numerous assembly, or diet of electors was here reflected in the waves of the great German stream. When the election commenced, and the Archbishop Aribio of Mentz was the first to give his vote, he named Conrad the Elder. The archbishops and bishops followed. Conrad, surnamed the Salic, a nobleman of *Franconia*, was elected. The new king was now conducted to Mentz to be there solemnly anointed and crowned.

"Shortly after the commencement of his reign he advanced into Italy, where in Milan he was crowned king of Italy, and subsequently in Rome, Emperor. He died at Utrecht in 1039." Kohlrush, p. 137.

"Conrad was succeeded by his son, Henry III. He was crowned Emperor in Rome at the Christmas Festival, 1046, by Pope Clement II. Henry died suddenly in the year 1056, at Lothfield, near Blankenbury."

Henry the III. was succeeded by his son, Henry IV., who

died at Liege in the year 1106, and was succeeded by his son Henry V., who was crowned Emperor by Pope Paschal, in Rome, April 13th, 1111, of whom Hallam, in his *Middle Ages*, page 229, says: "At his death, in 1125, the male line of the Franconian Emperors was at an end." Thus ended the fourth head of the "Leopard Beast." We now proceed to examine the testimony concerning

THE FIFTH HEAD—THE HOUSE OF SWABIA.

On the death of Henry V. (1125) "the Franconian emperors were at an end."

"Accordingly in 1125, the German tribes again encamped on the banks of the Rhine, in the vicinity of Mentz. Ten princes were selected. The archbishop persuaded them to make choice of Lothaire, duke of Saxony, who was elevated to the throne. Lothaire was seized suddenly ill and died in the year 1138. On the death of Lothaire, in 1138, the partisans of the House of Swabia made a hasty and irregular election of Conrad, in which the Saxon faction found itself obliged to yield.

"The Emperor Conrad died at Bamberg in the year 1152, and recommended, before his death, his nephew, Frederick Barbarossa, duke of Swabia."

Frederick went to Rome and was crowned emperor in St. Peter's Church, on the 18th of June, 1155. Frederick I. was one of the most powerful, high minded and valiant of all the German emperors, with a will firm as iron. It was said by one historian, "Germany has an emperor, but other nations only petty kings." The Emperor Frederick Barbarossa was drowned in the river Selph, on the 10th day of June, 1190.

With the death of Frederick Barbarossa commences the period called by historians 'The Grand Interregnum,' in which it is utterly impossible to find a legitimately elected imperial successor.

Speaking of the condition of the political elements during the above period, Koch, in his *History of Europe*, remarks:

"The downfall of imperial authority, and the House of Hoenstaufen, (or Swabia,) and the new power usurped by the princes and states of the empire, occasioned a long series of troubles in Germany, and that frightful state of anarchy known by the name of the Grand Interregnum. Strength then triumphed over law and right. The government was altered from its basis."

"The numerous republics which had sprung up in Italy, in

the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, were torn to pieces by the contending factions, and a prey to mutual and incessant hostilities. What contributed to augment the trouble and confusion in that unhappy country was, that during a long series of years no emperor had repaired thither in person, or made the smallest attempt to restore imperial authority in those states."

The following testimony, from Proctor's History of Italy, p. 55, will be read by the student of Prophecy and History, with interest:

"From the middle of the thirteenth century the unhappy divisions of factions which raged without principle or object, had the effect of depriving Italian history of all general or determined connection. For above two hundred years we shall be at a loss to discover among the numerous states of Italy any moment of common action and union on which it is possible to rest as an epoch in her annals. We are thrown on a wide and tempestuous sea of endless revolution, and bloodshed, and crime, and yet these are not the storms of barbarism. The refulgence of intellectual light, the revival of poetry and literature, the dawn and noontide of immortal art play over the troubled scene in strange contrast with its gloomy horrors, with the atrocities of implacable factions, the din of unceasing wars, the appalling silence of domestic tragedy."

Thus, with the death of Frederick Barbarossa, terminated the fifth head; and God's judgments fell heavily upon the Papal power.

THE SIXTH HEAD—SPAIN.

At about the middle of the sixteenth century Charles V., emperor of Germany and king of Spain, became the great ruling power in Europe, and, as the following history will show, put an end to this long distracted state of things. By being united with the Catholic church, as all the preceding heads had been, Spain thus became the sixth head.

Goodrich's History of Rome, p. 310, says: "Aided by the abilities of Gonsalvo de Cordova, the great captain, he (Charles V.) succeeded in expelling the French from Naples, which thus became united to the Spanish monarchy. Charles V., who was at the same time emperor of Germany and king of Spain, carried on long wars with his rival, Francis I., of France, and at length dispossessed him of all his Italian domains.

(3A)

"Charles then added the title of King of Lombardy to his other dignities. For nearly two hundred years after his death, Italy was ruled chiefly by the kings of Spain."

Gibbon, vol. 6, p. 511, says: "The French and Germans at length withdrew from the field of battle; Milan, Naples, Sicily, Sardinia, and the sea-coast of Tuscany, were firmly possessed by the Spaniards; and it became their interest to maintain the peace and dependence of Italy, which continued almost without disturbance from the middle of the sixteenth to the opening of the eighteenth century. The Vatican was swayed and protected by the religious policy of the Catholic king,"—the King of Spain. Thus Spain became the sixth head of the Beast, and continued, as we shall see, till 1713, when Spain was succeeded by Austria.

No country upon earth put to death and tortured so many victims, as the kings of Roman Catholic Spain.

SEVENTH HEAD—AUSTRIA.

Spain was finally succeeded by Austria, which became the great ruling power in Europe in connection with the Catholic church in 1713.

The following short extract is all we think necessary to give on this point, as the history is generally so well known: Goodrich's History of Rome, p. 320,—*"The kingdom of Naples passed from the Spanish dominions to a prince of the house of Austria, in 1713; and about the same time Piedmont, Savoy and Sardinia, were erected into a monarchy, with the title of the Kingdom of Sardinia. The political state of Italy suffered no material alteration from this time till the French Revolution. The Austrian influence was then predominant in Italy."* Austria is thus shown to be the seventh head of the Beast. We might have given ten-fold more history on these points, if we had thought it necessary, and the limits to which we have restricted ourselves in the present work would have permitted it. But we trust we have given sufficient to satisfy the reader on these points.

Having now shown that the seven heads of the beast "like a leopard," are, 1st, the Greek empire; 2d, France; 3d, Saxony; 4th, Franconia; 5th, Swabia; 6th, Spain, and 7th, Austria, we shall, in the next place, show the fulfillment of the forty-two months' war, by this power, on the saints. We would remark, first, however, that this period is explained in chapter xi: 3, to be "one thousand two hundred and three score days." These days are, beyond question, to be understood as so

many years, not only from the fact that we have this rule laid down in the Bible, in regard to prophetic days (see Ezek., iv : 6), but from the fact that 1260 literal days could not possibly cover the rise and fall of the seven kingdoms, as symbolized by the seven heads. This, we think, should be quite sufficient to satisfy the reader that those days are to be understood as so many years. The "war with the saints," by the beast under consideration, was, therefore, to be just 1260 years long.

That this period commenced in A. D. 532, we think the following from Bower's History of the Popes, vol 1, p. 334, unmistakably proves—

"A. D. 532, while the Arian king was striving, by the most just and equitable laws, to clear the church from all simony in the west, the Catholic emperor was employing the most unjust and unchristian means of clearing her from all heresies in the east, that of persecution, and the most cruel persecution any Christian emperor had yet set on foot, or countenanced. For by an edict which he issued to unite all men in one faith, whether Jews, Gentiles, or Christians, such as did not, IN THE TERM OF THREE MONTHS, embrace and profess the Catholic faith, were declared infamous, and, as such, excluded from all employments, both civil and military, rendered incapable of leaving anything by will, and *their estates confiscated*, whether *real* or *personal*. These were convincing arguments of the truth of the *Catholic faith*. But many, however, withstood them; and against such as did, the *imperial edict* was executed with the utmost rigor. Great numbers were driven from their habitations, with their wives and children, STRIPPED and NAKED. Others betook themselves to flight, carrying with them what they could conceal, for their support and maintenance; but they were *plundered of the little they had*, and many of them INHUMANLY MASSACRED, by the *Catholic peasants, and soldiery who guarded the passes.*"

The above history, we conceive, is all that could reasonably be required on this point. That the Greek empire here commenced a most furious "war with the saints," is clearly proved, beyond controversy, since the edict, both according to Bower and Gibbon, was executed with the UTMOST RIGOR.

Gibbon says (vol. 3, p. 264):

"But in the creed of Justinian the guilt of murder could not be applied to the slaughter of unbelievers; and he piously labored to establish with fire and sword the unity of the Christian faith."

The above history furnishes us with the clearest evidence

of the consummation of the union of the Greek empire with the Catholic church, and *vice versa*, in the highest possible sense of the term. No union of civil and ecclesiastical powers could be more complete, and attended with more fearful and more terrible consequences to the church of Christ.

Up to this time, toleration had existed. Of this fact, the edict itself furnishes sufficient evidence. Gibbon, however, also says that the "Arian church and clergy, even in Constantinople, at the time of this edict, equalled the wealth and magnificence of the Senate." Such a state of things could not have been the order of the times, if toleration had not previously existed. Hence, the beginning of the "war with the saints" could not have taken place prior to A. D. 532.

Here we find a clear explanation to all our past mistakes and disappointments on this subject. We have, in all our past movements, commenced the periods—the 1260 and 1335—before the war commenced, but not so now; the edict was executed, says the historian, with the "utmost rigor"—"with sword and fire." As no edict could be more *comprehensive*, executed with *greater rigor*, and with more *terrible* and *destructive* consequences to the church of Christ, it is certain, therefore, that A. D. 532 was the beginning of the war on the saints, and consequently of the 1260 years.

This edict was incorporated into the Justinian code and thereby continued in force for 1260 years—to A. D. 1792, when it, together with the code, was abolished, toleration of religious worship re-established and the judgments of God executed upon the persecutors, as history will most clearly and unmistakably prove.

We have already proved that Austria was the seventh head of the beast from 1713 to the beginning of the French revolution; therefore, we are under the necessity of considering France the *eighth head*, or king, and, by consequence, the "beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit;" for it will be seen by chapter xvii: 10, 11, that the eighth king and the beast out of the bottomless pit are one and the same power.

That we are right is further proved from the consideration that it was, as is generally admitted by expositors, in the French revolution that the "two witnesses" were "slain," as brought to view in the 11th chapter and 7th verse, which reads thus: "And when they," that is, the "two witnesses," "shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and shall kill them."

Without attempting to show, just here, what the two witnesses are in particular, the fact that they are the "witnesses" of Christ, and that the "beast" "out of the bottomless pit" makes war on them to kill them, shows very clearly that the "beast" is an infidel or atheistical power. No more certain proof on this point could be required, as no power would make war on the witnesses of Christ, without being a pagan or an infidel power. That this was the character of France, from about the beginning of the revolution, is a fact that is universally known. Indeed, it is the only pagan or infidel power that has ever existed in the western Roman empire since the overthrow of the Saxons, Huns, &c., by Charlemagne. So that we cannot be mistaken in the fact that the eighth head represented France, from about the beginning, as we have already stated, of the French revolution.

As a succinct statement of the events of the French revolution, and its terrible consequences to the Catholic church, may be necessary at this point to enable the reader to more fully comprehend the subject, we give the following extract from the History of the Church, by Goodrich, pp. 183, 184:

"At the commencement of the French revolution, the clergy in France were both numerous and wealthy. They amounted to no less than eighteen archbishops, one hundred and eleven bishops, and one hundred and fifty thousand priests, having under their control a revenue of five millions sterling, annually, besides three thousand four hundred convents. The clergy and their wealth were now attacked by the INFIDEL revolutionists, and fell an easy prey. The titles and revenues of the clergy were taken away, by a decree of the Constituent Assembly; the possessions of the church were now declared to be the property of the nation; the religious orders were abolished, the monks and nuns were ejected from their convents, and their immense wealth seized for the nation. The revolutionary torrent, which was thus set in motion, destroyed law, government and religion in France, and laid waste the ROMAN CHURCH, both there and in neighboring countries. The priests were massacred, her silver shrines and saints were turned into money for the payment of the troops, her bells were converted into cannon, and her churches and convents into barracks for soldiers. From the Atlantic to the Adriatic she presented but one appalling spectacle. She had shed the blood of saints and prophets, and God now gave her blood to drink."

No one can fail to see, we think, from the above, that France was not only the beast out of the bottomless pit, but

also the instrument in the purpose of God in executing His terrible judgments upon the persecutors of His saints. The particular work of the beast like a leopard was, as we have seen, to sustain the Catholic Church and make war with the saints. Now, the fact that France in 1792, instead of sustaining the Catholic Church, and making war on the saints, was acting directly the reverse—was making war on the Catholic Church herself in the most furious and destructive manner, proves positively that France does not belong to the Leopard beast, and therefore France is, and has been ever since 1792, the eighth king and beast out of the bottomless pit.

The difference between these two beasts is thus very clearly seen. The former (Leopard beast) made war on the saints, and the latter (beast out of the bottomless pit—France) made war on the Catholic Church and the former beast power, and, as we shall soon prove, liberated the saints from their persecutors, by granting them the free exercise of their religion.

Was this all done by 1792? We answer it was. First, then, as to toleration of religious worship; Bowers' History, vol. 3, p. 414, says: "About the commencement of the year 1792, the direct personal assaults on the ecclesiastics [Roman] began. The Assembly proclaimed the toleration of *all* religious worship."

Allison's History of Europe, vol. 1, p. 110, says: "The great evils which afflicted France, were removed by its [the Assembly's] exertions. Liberty of religious worship, but imperfectly provided for in 1787, was secured in its fullest extent."

DeCormenin, vol. 2, p. 410, says: "The Legislative Assembly suppressed the pensions, the State allowed to the refractory; decreed the liberty of worship, the emancipation of all monastic orders, the marriage of priests, and prohibited all religious costumes."

Thus we have proved by facts, in history, that "toleration to *all* religious worship" was established "in the commencement of 1792," "in its fullest extent."

Therefore, when toleration of religious faith and worship was *fully* established, as it was in the beginning of 1792, the 1260 years, in all its different phases, ended. It is impossible that there could be "war with the saints" after "toleration of *all* religious worship" was established to the "fullest extent."

Having thus shown that the war on the saints ceased in the beginning of 1792, we shall next show that the judgments of God, by captivity and sword, were executed at the same time,

upon their persecutors.

Bowers' History of the Popes, vol. 3, p. 413, says: "On November 29, 1791, the Assembly decreed that the *Roman* ecclesiastics who would not comply with the requirements of the civil constitution, should be subject to the penalties of their disobedience.

"The agitation of the kingdom of France being on the increase continually, through the secret briefs and bulls of Pius VI., aided by the wiles and machinations of the Roman Priests, until all parts of the country were almost in anarchy, the Assembly resolved, if possible, to allay the impending tornado by another act. They therefore passed a decree, May 26th, 1792, commanding the immediate banishment of every ecclesiastic, *without exception*, who would not take the civic oath."

Says Marsh's Ecclesiastical History, p. 300:

"A civil constitution was formed for the clergy, to which all were required to swear, on pain of death or banishment. The great body refused, and priest and altar were overturned, and blood, once esteemed sacred, flowed to the horses' bridles. Such as could, escaped through a thousand dangers, and found an asylum in foreign countries. No tongue can tell the woes of the nation."

Goodrich, in his History of the Church, p. 184, says, as we have before stated: "Her priests were massacred, her silver shrines and saints were turned into money for the payment of the troops, her bells were converted into cannon, and her churches and convents into barracks for soldiers. From the Atlantic to the Adriatic she presented but one appalling spectacle. She had shed the blood of saints and prophets, and God now gave her blood to *drink*."

In "The Recent Occurrences of Europe," by Thomas Coke, LL.D., published in 1809, it is stated on page 174, that in 1792, "One hundred and thirty-eight bishops, and sixty-four thousand priests of the lower order" were banished from France; and what were not banished were thrown into prison, and between the 2d and 9th of September of the same year, they were all inhumanly massacred.

The Hon. Gerard Noel says:

"Can the overthrow of the monastic orders, plunder of the church property, the destruction of religion by legislative enactment, and the massacre of a hundred thousand of her clergy, be consistent with any reasonable estimate of domination and power. Under such terrific judgments upon the persecutors,

can we refuse to admit that the period of the *twelve hundred and sixty years* has terminated its course?"

Louis the XVI. was dethroned on the 10th of August 1792, and with his wife and children was thrown into prison on the 13th of the same month, where they remained until they were put to death. Allison's History of Europe, vol. 1, p. 130.

Thus God has faithfully fulfilled His word by establishing complete liberty of religious worship to the saints, and at the same time, and by the same instrumentality, executing His judgments upon those who had led them into "captivity" and "killed" them with the "sword."

Thus, we have in the Revelation, two separate and widely different beasts brought to view, as also two separate and widely different Churches.

The first beast (the leopard) began to make war on the saints (the true church) "with sword and fire," in 532, and the second beast (the beast out of the bottomless pit—France) began to make war on the Roman Catholics (the apostate church), by fire and sword in the beginning of 1792, which fixes the beginning and end of the 1260 years beyond all possible mistake.

We have thus *fully* established the fact that the 1260 years, of Revelation, ended in the spring of 1792, at the latest, since France, the beast out of the bottomless pit, and last ruling power in prophecy, then established complete toleration of religious worship, and also, began at the same time to execute the judgments of God upon the bloody persecutors of the saints.

Thus every ground of doubt in regard to the war upon the saints having began, in A. D., 532, when Justinian emperor of the Greek empire, issued his edict to compel "all men, whether Jews, Gentiles, or Christians," under the penalties of death or banishment, to "embrace and profess the Catholic faith, is removed forever." Therefore, as the 1260 years, from this point, ended in the spring of 1792, the 1335 years which bring us to the standing up of "Michael" and the resurrection (Dan 12: 1-3, 12,) will end in the beginning or fore part of 1867, as 75 years, the difference between the 1260 and the 1335, beginning in the fore part of 1792, will terminate at the same time in the year, in 1867.

That the 1260 and the 1335 years began at the same time, there can be no doubt, since they both were to begin with the commencement of the "war with the saints."

That the 1335 days reach to the coming of the Lord, we think that there is nothing more susceptible of proof in the

Bible. In Daniel xii: 1, 2, certain "wonders" are brought to view—the standing up of Michael—time of trouble—deliverance of Daniel's people; every one found written in the Book; and the awaking of "many of them that sleep in the dust," &c. It will be seen that the resurrection is here mentioned among the wonders, and the last one, too, in the category. We wish this fact to be particularly noticed. Therefore, in whatever light the standing up of Michael may be seen, it is certain that the coming of Christ must be embraced in the wonders, since the resurrection cannot take place prior to his advent. Therefore, when the angel, as recorded in verse 6, asks, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" he virtually asks, how long shall it be to the resurrection, as that is the last wonder mentioned. This question was asked by an angel of God, sent to Daniel for this purpose; and, therefore, the question demands a definite answer; the answer, therefore, must reach to the end of the wonders—to the resurrection and coming of Christ. Therefore, it is the resurrection that is definitely pointed out by the 1335 days. That this view of the case is correct, is further proved by the fact that Daniel is to rest and stand in his lot at the end of the days, which necessarily involves a resurrection.

"At the end of the days." This phrase, where it stands in connection with prophetic periods, has always been definitely fulfilled; or, in other words, all events marking the termination of prophetic periods, have always been fulfilled in the last day, or year, of those periods. Thus the children of Israel left Egypt on the self same day that the 430 years ended. They also crossed over Jordan five days before the forty years of their wandering in the wilderness was out; and the King of Babylon was killed in the seventieth year of the captivity, &c. This we regard as quite sufficient to establish the fact that the resurrection will take place sometime in or during the last year of the 1335.

The declaration, "Blessed is he that waiteth and COMETH TO the thousand, three hundred and five and thirty days," is in harmony with this view.

The words "cometh to," in the original, are *Bow*, which, according to Pick's Bible Students' Hebrew Concordance, means to "enter, enter upon, or into." In every instance in the Bible where the words "enter," or "entered upon," or "into," occurs, it is the same word.

From the foregoing it will be seen that the Lord may come any time in the 1335th year, and, therefore, as the 1335th

year, ending in the fore part, as we have proved, of 1867, must begin in the fore part of 1866, the Lord may come in the present year, to which our hearts respond, Amen.

We do not pretend to fix the *day* and *hour* of our Saviour's coming, but the knowledge of the year as we have seen is unmistakably fixed. May heaven grant that both our readers and ourselves may be ready for the glorious morn so soon to be realized.

Therefore, in whatever light the standing up of Christ must be seen, it is certain that the coming of Christ must be placed in the wonders, since the resurrection cannot take place prior to his advent. Therefore, when the angel, as recorded in verse 6, asks, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" he virtually asks, how long shall it be to the resurrection, as that is the last wonder mentioned. This question was asked by an angel of God, sent to Daniel for this purpose; and, therefore, the question demands a definite answer; the answer, therefore, must reach to the end of the wonders—to the resurrection and coming of Christ. Therefore, it is the resurrection that is definitely pointed out by the 1335 days. That this view of the case is correct, is further proved by the fact that Daniel is to rest and stand in his lot at the end of the days, which necessarily involves a resurrection. At the end of the days. This phrase, where it stands in connection with prophetic periods, has always been definitely fulfilled; or, in other words, all events marking the termination of prophetic periods, have always been fulfilled in the last day, or year, of those periods. Thus the children of Israel left Egypt on the self same day that the 430 years ended. They also crossed over Jordan five days before the forty years of their wandering in the wilderness was out; and the King of Babylon was killed in the seventieth year of the captivity. This we regard as quite sufficient to establish the fact that the resurrection will take place sometime in or during the last year of the 1335. The declaration, "Blessed is he that waiteth and cometh to the thousand, three hundred and five and thirty days," is in harmony with this view. The words "cometh to," in the original, are *Boo*, which, according to Pick's Bible Students' Hebrew Concordance, means to "enter, enter upon, or into." In every instance in the Bible where the words "enter," or "entered upon," or "into," occurs, it is the same word. From the foregoing it will be seen that the Lord may come any time in the 1335th year, and, therefore, as the 1335th

CHAPTER IV.

EXPOSITION OF THE "LITTLE HORN," AND HIS "WAR WITH THE SAINTS."—Daniel vii :

8. I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots; and behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.

21. I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them;

22. Until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High: and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.

25. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.

26. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it unto the end.

Before entering directly upon this exposition, we would remark that it might have been embraced or included in the exposition of the previous chapter, but we have thought it best, in the present work, to give each chain of prophecy a separate exposition, as by so doing the subject will probably be made much clearer, especially to those who are not very familiar with it, than otherwise. We hope, therefore, that each chapter and exposition will be carefully examined.

The first point to settle is, what are we to understand by a "horn"? We answer, that a "horn" in prophecy always, as is universally admitted, represents a purely civil government, or "kingdom," from the fact that this was the character of the "ten kings" or "kingdoms," into which the "fourth," or Roman "kingdom," was divided, as represented by the "ten horns" of the "fourth beast," in verses 7, 23, 24, which read as follows:

"Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms,

and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces.

"And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise," &c.

"King" and "kingdom," in prophecy, are synonymous terms, from the fact that, in the 17th verse, the "four beasts" are declared to be "four kings," while in the 23d verse the "fourth beast" is declared to be the "fourth kingdom." King and kingdom, therefore, mean the same thing. Now, as the "ten horns" of this "fourth beast" represented ten civil governments or kingdoms, into which the "fourth kingdom" was divided, therefore the other "little horn" which came up after them, must represent a *civil* government or kingdom, also, as the same law that applies to the *ten* must also apply to the other—the eleventh—for they are all "horns."

Indeed, all the horns in the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation, as symbolizing earthly powers, are admitted, as they must be, to apply to *kingdoms*. Thus the two horns of the "ram" represented the kingdoms of Media and Persia; the one horn of the goat, the kingdom of Grecia in its consolidated state; the ten horns of the dragon, and the ten horns of the beast like a leopard, are all admitted to represent so many purely civil governments.

To say that a "horn," in one instance represents one thing, and in another, something else, perhaps directly opposite, would be to destroy prophecy altogether. There must be some general law of interpretation. A horn, in one instance, must mean the same as in another. Therefore, if it can be proved that all the other horns in Daniel and Revelation represent *purely* civil governments, this settles the fact in regard to this one. This, we think, is too plain a matter to be questioned.

The only difference that exists between this last, or eleventh horn, and any of the other ten, consists in its having "eyes" and a "mouth," which are generally understood to represent an ecclesiastical power, or a church. And this must be so in the very nature of things, since the "eyes" and "mouth" must represent something quite opposite to the horn itself, and therefore quite opposite to civil power: and the opposite to civil power is ecclesiastical. That this view is correct we will now prove positively from chapter 11: 30, where we have this same "horn" or "king" fully explained thus:

"For the ships of Chittim shall come against him: therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant; so shall he do; he shall even re-

turn, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant."

By the "ships of Chittim coming against him," is meant the incursion of those northern barbarian nations against the Roman empire, in the third and fourth centuries, from what was anciently called the land of Chittim. They came, as the prophecy declares, especially the Vandals, in *ships*. This verse shows that there was a union effected between the "king," or Roman power, on the one hand, and an apostate church on the other; for "he shall have *intelligence*" or "*understanding*," as some translators render it, "with them that forsake the holy covenant." The result of this "*intelligence*," "*understanding*," or union, as we are informed in the following verses, is a "*war with the saints*," which proves positively that this "king" and the "little horn," under consideration, are synonymous—since there was but one power to arise in the world that was to become united with an apostate church, and make war "with the saints."

Here, then, the "eyes" and "mouth" in the "little horn" are explained, unmistakably, to be an apostate church; and the "eyes" and "mouth" being in the horn, shows that there was a union effected between the two, or, in other words, the apostate church was *nationalized*, so that the faith and worship of the church became a law in the empire.

This union between the civil power of Rome and the apostate church is still further proved in Rev. 17: 1-6. Here John, the Revelator, is called to see "the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters; with whom the kings of the earth have committed fornication." The "kings of the earth" here, all admit, represent the same power as the "little horn" under consideration, which proves that the "little horn" represents the *civil* or imperial Roman power, and not the papacy, as some have supposed, since no one has attempted to show that the "kings of the earth" and the papacy are synonymous.

The fact that the "kings of the earth" are just seven in number, shows that it is impossible that they could apply to the papacy, since the papacy has been and has ever claimed to be *one* unbroken chain from first to last.

As, therefore, the papacy cannot be said to be *seven kings*, which were to rise and fall in a consecutive order, the question is settled forever that the papacy is not meant.

The fact that the papacy was not the power against which the "ships of Chittim" came, according to Daniel 11: 30, is positive proof of itself that the "little horn" and the papacy are not

synonymous. Those who apply the "little horn" to the papacy would have to date its rise in 754, since the popes were in no sense civil rulers prior to that date; and even then their civil power was entirely *subordinate* to the kings and emperors of France. This would extend the 1260 days, or years, to 2014, and the 1335 to 2089.

No further evidence, we think, will be required to satisfy any and all of our readers that the "little horn" does not apply to the papacy.

The "great whore" with whom the "kings of the earth have committed fornication," is called "THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." She is also shown to be "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." That the apostate church, thus symbolized, is synonymous with "them that forsake the holy covenant," in Dan. 11: 31, there can be no doubt, and therefore, the "little horn" with "eyes" and a "mouth" is thus shown to symbolize a union between a civil government and an apostate church.

This union must result in a "war with the saints" from the fact that the union must result in establishing the creed or faith of the apostate church, as a law, under the penalties of death and banishment, in the empire; otherwise she could not have been drunken with their blood.

Having now shown what is required to fulfill the prophecy, we shall next proceed to identify the power symbolized by the "little horn," show its rise, and also, the time when it commenced to "make war with the saints."

The horn was to rise, as we learn from the verses quoted at the beginning of the article, after the "ten horns," which represented the "ten kings," or kingdoms, into which the fourth kingdom was to be divided. This fourth kingdom, all expositors agree, represented the Roman empire, since that was not only the fourth empire in a regular succession, but the only empire that has ever been divided into ten kingdoms. The first of these four empires, as we learn in Dan. 2: 38, where Daniel is giving an explanation of the great image, was Babylon. The second, we learn in ch. 5: 38, and 8: 20, was Medo-Persia. The third (8: 21) was Grecia. Grecia was overthrown by the Roman empire according to all history on this subject; so that we cannot be mistaken in the fact that the Roman empire was, or is the fourth empire.

The ten horns, or kingdoms, are understood very nearly alike by the different expositors, and are as follows:

1. The Ostrogoths,	377
2. The Visigoths,	378
3. The Alemanni,	400
4. The Franks,	407
5. The Burgundians,	407
6. The Britons,	409
7. The Suevi,	409
8. The Vandals,	439
9. The Huns,	445
10. The Saxons,	455

Thus, between 377 and 455, we have the Roman empire divided into ten kingdoms, as represented by the ten horns.

As the Roman empire in the West, which was the Roman empire proper, was all divided between the ten kingdoms, therefore we must look for the eleventh horn to rise out of the eastern division, or province; and by consequence, we find that a power arose there that answers to every particular in the prophecy, as we shall most clearly prove.

This power was what is commonly called the Greek empire, which took its rise on the final overthrow of the Roman empire, by Odoacer, as the following history from Gibbon, vol. 3, p. 512, will show:

"After the resignation of Augustulus, the submissive people of Italy were prepared to obey, without a murmur, the authority which he [Odoacer] should condescend to exercise as the vicegerent of the emperor of the West. But Odoacer had determined to abolish that useless and expensive office; and such is the weight of antique prejudice, that it required some boldness and penetration to discover the extreme facility of the enterprise. The unfortunate Augustulus was made the instrument of his own disgrace. He signified his resignation to the Senate, and that assembly, in their last act of obedience to a Roman prince, still affected the spirit of freedom and the forms of the constitution. An epistle was addressed, by their *unanimous decree*, to the Emperor Zeno, who had lately been restored, after a short rebellion, to the Byzantine [Greek] throne. They solemnly disclaim the necessity, or even the wish, to continue any longer the imperial succession in Italy: since, in their opinion, the majesty of a sole monarch, is sufficient to pervade and protect at the same time, both the East and the West. In their own name, and in the name of the people, they consent that the seat of **UNIVERSAL EMPIRE** shall be *transferred* from **ROME** to **CONSTANTINOPLE**; and they hereby renounce the right of choosing their own master, **THE ONLY VESTIGE THAT YET REMAINED OF**

THE AUTHORITY WHICH HAD GIVEN LAWS TO THE WORLD." * * * "His [Zeno's] vanity was gratified by the title of SOLE EMPEROR, and by the statues erected to his honor in the several quarters of Rome; and he gratefully accepted the imperial ensign, the sacred ornaments of the throne and palace, which the barbarians were not unwilling to remove from the sight of the people."

From the above history it is proved that the Greek empire succeeded the Roman empire, and thus became the only imperial power in both the East and the West.

Thus the "little horn" kingdom arose in 476, but the union with the mother of harlots, or Roman Catholic church, as we shall soon see, was not fully effected until A. D. 532.

Further evidence that the Greek empire was the little horn under consideration, is found in the fact that that is the *only* power that ever plucked up three of the first horns by the roots, viz.: the Vandals, the Ostrogoths and the Alemani.

This we regard as positive evidence that the Greek empire was the "little horn" that was to make the "war with the saints," by establishing a union with the Roman Catholic church—"the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth."

Moreover, as there was to be but one such power, that was to establish a union with the Roman Catholic church, and commence this war with the saints, therefore, if we can prove, by reliable facts in history, that the Greek empire did accomplish this work, we shall have again fully established the point.

That this was all effected, in the highest sense, in 532, the following from Bower's History of the Popes, vol. 1, p. 324, will very clearly show:

"While the Arian king was striving, by the most just and equitable laws, to clear the church from all simony in the West, the Catholic emperor was employing the most unjust and unchristian means of clearing her from all heresies in the East—that of persecution; and the most cruel persecution any Christian emperor had yet set on foot, or countenanced. For by an edict which he issued, to unite all men in one faith, whether Jews, Gentiles, or Christians, such as did not, in the term of three months, embrace and profess the Catholic faith, were declared infamous; and, as such, excluded from all employments, both civil and military, rendered incapable of leaving anything by will, and their estates confiscated, whether real or personal. These were convincing arguments of the truth of the Catholic faith; but many, however, with-

stood them; and against such as did, the imperial edict was executed with the **UTMOST RIGOR**. Great numbers were driven from their homes, with their wives and children, *stripped and naked*. Others betook themselves to flight, carrying with them what they could conceal, for their support and maintenance; but they were plundered of the little they had, and many of them inhumanly massacred by the Catholic peasants, or the soldiery, who guarded the passes."

That this edict consummated, to the fullest extent, the union between the Greek empire and the Roman Catholic church, there is no room to doubt for a moment.

The faith and worship of the Catholic church, it will be seen, became a law in the empire, under the penalties of death and banishment; therefore, no union between Church and State could possibly be more complete.

As this edict was a declaration of war against all who refused to "embrace and profess the Catholic faith," and as it was "executed with the **UTMOST RIGOR**," therefore we cannot doubt for a moment, that this was the commencement of the war with the saints by the "little horn."

Gibbon, in vol. 3, p. 265, in speaking of the "RIGOR" with which this edict was executed, says, that "in the creed of Justinian the guilt of murder could not be applied to the slaughter of unbelievers; and he piously labored to establish with 'FIRE AND SWORD' the unity of the Christian faith."

Thus both Bower and Gibbon testify to the terrible manner in which this edict was executed against all who refused to be baptized into the "THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH."

With all these facts before us, we can say, that if the little horn did not commence making "war with the saints" in A. D. 532, then nothing of the kind has ever yet transpired, and by consequence, we are at least 1260 years this side of the coming of Christ. Indeed, if putting the saints to death by *fire and sword*, and banishing them from the empire, is not making war upon them, then such a thing is utterly impossible or out of the question.

The fact that the first of the three horns—the Vandals—was subdued in 533, shows that the war with the saints must have begun as early, at least, as 532.

Says Gibbon, vol. 3, p. 64: "The defeat of the Vandals and the freedom of Africa, were announced to the city on the eve of St. Cyprian. * * * The Arians, conscious that their reign had expired, resigned the temple to the Catholics, who rescued their saint from profane hands, performed the

holy rites, and loudly proclaimed the creed of Athanasius and Justinian. One awful hour reversed the fortunes of the contending parties."

This occurred, according to the united testimony of history, in 533, which shows that 532 is the latest point at which we can begin the "war with the saints," since the only edict issued anywhere in that vicinity, to establish the Catholic church was issued in that year.

And here it may be well, before going farther, to give an explanation, or show the reason, of our past disappointments; and this we will do.

In 1843-'44, the "war with the saints" was understood to have begun in 508, when Clovis, King of the Franks, made war on the Burgundians.

But this was manifestly an error. First, because France, as we have already seen, was not the "*little horn*" or beast like a leopard; and second, because that was not a religious war but a war of conquest for territory. Toleration of religious worship existed at that very time, and afterward, just as much, or to as great an extent, as it did before.

France and Burgundy were two of the ten kingdoms of the fourth beast empire of Daniel, and of the dragon empire of Revelation, and were so understood at that time. Therefore a war of one of those ten kingdoms upon another, could not possibly be a war, by the "little" or eleventh "horn," or beast like a leopard, with the saints. There was no law issued by France at that time to compel all men to embrace and profess the Roman Catholic religion. It was simply nothing more or less than a war of one of the horns of the dragon upon another horn of the dragon. This, we think, is sufficient to show the mistake of the Brethren in 1843-'44.

Our mistake in 1854 consisted in this: It was supposed that the union of the church of Rome and the church of Constantinople, which took place in A. D. 519, set up, or established, the abomination of desolation. That this was a necessary step is evident from the fact that the Roman Catholic faith and worship could not be established by the civil authority, until the different branches of the church were agreed among themselves as to what the faith was. This being clearly defined and settled by the union of the two churches, the next step necessary was for the civil authority, by an edict, to carry it into effect, under the penalties of death and banishment, and thus make it binding upon all men. Until this was done there could be no war with the saints, since all parties enjoyed the free exercise of their religion. The mere union of the

two branches of the Roman Catholic church in 519 did not effect those outside of them in the least. Toleration existed, as we have already seen, just as much after the union as it did before, and therefore there was no war with the saints until 532, when Justinian, as we have seen, issued the edict compelling all men to embrace and profess the Roman Catholic faith, under the penalties of death or banishment. For instance, the Catholic church is a unit to-day, but there is no war with the saints, for the simple reason that none of the governments enforce the Roman Catholic faith and worship under the penalties of death or banishment.

Thus we see that the simple reason of all our past mistakes is, that we commenced the periods before the actual beginning of the war with the saints. The point, according to the prophecy, is not where the Catholic church became a unit, or where the Pope of Rome was raised to the rank of the first bishop, but where the war on the saints actually began by the infliction of the penalties of the imperial law for refusing to embrace and profess the Catholic faith and worship. This shows that the edict of 532 is beyond all question the true beginning of the 1260 years. The 1260 years from this point, the length of time that the "little horn" was to "make war with the saints," would have ended in 1792, and by consequence, we find that France, the last power or kingdom in prophecy, as we have proved in the previous chapter, established toleration of religious worship in the beginning of that year, to the fullest extent.

Bower's History, vol. 3, p. 414, says: "About the commencement of the year 1792, the direct assaults upon the ecclesiastics [Roman] began. The Assembly proclaimed the toleration OF ALL RELIGIOUS WORSHIP."

Allison's History of Europe, vol. 1, p. 110, says: "The great evils which afflicted France were removed by its [the Assembly's] exertions. Liberty of religious worship, but imperfectly provided for in 1787, was secured in its FULLEST EXTENT."

DeCormenin, vol. 2, p. 410, says: "The Legislative Assembly suppressed the pensions the State allowed to the refractory; decreed the liberty of worship, the emancipation of all monastic orders, the marriage of the priests, and prohibited all religious costumes."

Thus we have proved by facts in history, that "toleration to all religious worship" was established "in the commencement of 1792," "in its FULLEST EXTENT."

Joseph II., of Austria, having established full toleration of

religious worship in his dominions, as early as 1781, and having thus broken up all union with the Catholic church, it therefore remained to France to complete the work, which was done, as we have seen, to the "fullest extent" in the beginning of 1792; and, by consequence, the 1260 years' "war with the saints" then ended, as no power can make war with the saints, and, at the same time, establish complete toleration of religious worship.

There was no union between infidel France and the Catholic church; but, on the contrary, they were at open war with each other. France issued a decree, May 26, 1792, commanding the immediate banishment of every Roman ecclesiastic, without exception, who would not take the oath to the constitution. See Bower's History of the Popes, vol. 3 (Amer. Ed.), p. 414.

Says Marsh's Ecclesiastical History, p. 300: "A civil constitution was formed for the clergy, to which all were required to swear, on pain of death or banishment. The great body refused, and priest and altar were overturned, and blood, once esteemed sacred, flowed to the horses' bridles. Such as could, escaped through a thousand dangers, and found an asylum in foreign countries."

"But the judgment shall set, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy unto the end."

This, unquestionably, had its fulfillment when the Legislative Assembly of France set in judgment upon the persecuting power in 1792 and took away his dominion to consume and to destroy the saints by proclaiming toleration to all religious worship, for most certainly the saints could not be consumed and destroyed after that.

We have thus shown that the 1260 years could not have terminated later than the beginning or forepart of 1792. Therefore the 1335 years, which bring us to the standing up of "Michael" and the resurrection, will end in the beginning or forepart of 1867, as seventy-five years, the difference between the 1260 and the 1335, beginning in the fore part of 1792, will terminate at the same time in the year, in 1867.

But as we have shown in the previous chapter that the coming of the Lord may take place any time during the last year of the 1335, therefore He may come as early as the present year—1866.

We next call the attention of the reader to the following chapter on the setting up of the abomination of desolation.

CHAPTER V.

THE ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION.

Matt. 24: 15.—"When ye, therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel, the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth let him understand.)"

In the above, our Saviour is supposed by many to have referred to the destruction of Jerusalem; but that this view is incorrect—that he had no such reference whatever, but, on the contrary, referred to an event which transpired some five hundred years subsequently, we think we shall be abundantly able to prove to the entire satisfaction of our readers.

1. Our Saviour declares that, when the "abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel, the prophet," shall "stand in the holy place," "then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time; no, nor ever shall be." This fact, of itself should be quite sufficient, we think, to satisfy all that the destruction of Jerusalem was not meant; for, to say that this was the *greatest* tribulation that ever had been, or ever should be, would be to falsify all the facts in history.

The destruction of 1,100,000 *infidel* Jews which took place at the destruction of Jerusalem, most certainly bears but a very small comparison to the destruction of over 50,000,000 of the believers in Christ, during the 1260 years of Roman Catholic persecution.

2. This tribulation was to be, according to the 22d verse, upon the "elect," ("But for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened;") and the "elect" is explained in the 9th verse to be those that should "be hated of all nations for" Christ's "name's sake." This shows that our Saviour, in this tribulation, had no reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, for the tribulation in that case fell entirely upon the infidel Jews; therefore, as the tribulation, resulting from the setting up, or standing of, the abomination of desolation in the "holy place," was to fall exclusively upon the elect—the believers in Christ, and to be such a tribulation upon them as "was not since the beginning of the world," nor ever should be, it is certain the destruction of Jerusalem was not alluded to.

Jerusalem was destroyed, and with it 1,100,000 Jews, in consequence of their rejection of Christ, and therefore, it could not be said to be a tribulation upon "the elect"—upon those that should be "hated of all nations for" His (Christ's) "name's sake;" thus showing that the standing of the abomination of desolation in the holy place and the destruction of Jerusalem, are two widely different events.

3. The instructions given to His disciples in the two cases, differ as widely as the events. In Matthew xxiv Jesus instructs His disciples (verses 16-18 and 22,) on seeing the "abomination of desolation" "stand in the holy place," to "flee to the mountains," and prohibits him that is "on the house-top" from coming down "to take anything out of his house;" and "him that is in the field," from returning back, "to take his clothes." He also commands them to pray that their "flight" might not be "in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day;" while in Luke 21: 21, where Jesus is plainly speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, no such prohibitions are given on the one hand, nor requirements made—to pray that their flight might "not be in the winter, neither on the Sabbath day,"—on the other, simply from the fact that there was no necessity for any such action on the part of the Church at that time; for Josephus informs us, in Wars, book 2, chap. 19, that Jerusalem was encompassed the first time, by the Roman armies under Cestus Gallus (which was to be the sign by which the disciples were to know that "the desolation thereof was nigh"), in the 12th year of Nero; that Cestus Gallus was finally driven away, after losing about 5,000 of his men, and never returned—that Jerusalem was not encompassed the second time until the first year of Vespasian, by Titus, which was over two years and a half after the defeat of Cestus Gallus.—See Wars, book 5, chap. 1.

Thus we have proved that the Christians had, at the destruction of Jerusalem, at least two years and a half to "flee," without a single obstruction in their way; and, therefore, having every opportunity to take everything with them that was moveable, it was their unmistakable duty to do so; and as we have before seen, our Saviour, in Luke, where he was speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem, did not prohibit them from doing so. Most certainly our Saviour would never have instructed His disciples to "flee to the mountains," at the destruction of Jerusalem, in a naked and destitute condition, when there was no occasion for it, and thus have inflicted a very great amount of *unnecessary* suffering upon them.

From this it is shown again, that Matt. 24: 15, and

onward, has no reference whatever to the destruction of Jerusalem.

4. By a reference to "Daniel, the prophet," chap. 11: 31, and 12: 11, it is shown that the "abomination of desolation," referred to by our Saviour, was to be set up 1335 days or years prior to the standing up of "Michael" and the resurrection; for after the wonders are mentioned, viz., the standing up of Michael, "the time of trouble," the deliverance "of every one that shall be found written in the book," the awaking of many of them that "sleep in the dust of the earth," &c., the question is asked, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" which question is answered by giving the 1335 days or years. As the resurrection is the last event in the category of the wonders, therefore the question and the answer cannot end prior to that event.

Thus we have proved again, *positively*, that the abomination of desolation was not set up at the destruction of Jerusalem, since the 1335 years, beginning at that event, would have terminated over 500 years ago.

Luke evidently records, in the twenty-first chapter, a *public* discourse of our Saviour's at the temple, to the Jews; and, therefore, he spoke in that discourse of the destruction of their city, and the calamities that were to fall upon them; while the discourse, as recorded in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew, was, as we learn in the third verse, a *private* discourse to the disciples; hence, in His instructions to them, He spoke of the calamities that were to befall the Christians during, as we shall soon show, the 1260 years of persecution—the result of the setting up, or standing of, the "abomination of desolation" in the "holy place."

Daniel does, indeed, speak of the destruction of Jerusalem, in the last verse of the ninth chapter in these words: "And for the overspreading of *abominations*'" (plural), that is, in consequence of the overflowing abominations or wickedness of the Jews, "he shall make it," [Jerusalem,] "desolate," &c. No one can fail to see, we think, whose eyes are not blinded by some selfish theory, that the "overspreading of *abominations*" (plural) of chapter 9: 27, which refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, differs very widely from the "*abomination*" (singular) "that maketh desolate," in chapters 11: 31, and 12: 11, which marks the beginning of the 1335 days or years.

Having thus settled the fact, that our Saviour, in Matthew 24: 15, had no reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, we shall next endeavor to settle the question as to what he did

of the "host" apostatized or transgressed *against* the daily sacrifice," as brought to view in the 12th verse, and thus became united with the "little horn." This will soon be made to appear beyond all chance of mistake.

"*Against*," then, is the correct translation. Now let us read verse 11, with the marginal reading, thus proved to be correct: "Yea, he magnified himself even *against* the Prince of the host, and *from* him," that is, from the Prince of the host (Christ), "the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down"—verse 12. "And an host was given him *against* the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression," or, as the margin correctly reads, "And the host was given over for the transgression," that is, on account of "the transgression *against* the daily sacrifice."

This should be sufficient, we think, to satisfy every one that the "daily" sacrifice, in all these places, refers to the true Christian worship, for no other sacrifice was ever taken from Christ—the prince of the host—and from his sanctuary. And further, that was the only sacrifice that was transgressed *against* by the apostate church.

To make this matter still plainer, if possible, (which we doubt that it can be), let us turn to chapter xi: 30-32, where we shall find the same things spoken of again.

1. In the 30th verse we are told that this same "horn" or "king" shall have "*indignation against the holy covenant.*"

2. He shall "have *intelligence* with them that *forsake* the holy covenant."

3. In verse 31st we are told that by virtue of "*arms*" he "shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice," that is, from the "sanctuary of strength," and "shall place the abomination that maketh desolate," that is, in the "sanctuary of strength."

Now Jesus, in Matt. xxiv, in referring to this *same event*, as we have already seen, says that "the abomination of desolation was to "stand in the *holy place*," thus proving that the "sanctuary of strength" is the *holy place*, or temple of God; and the same thing is affirmed by Paul, in 2d Thes. ii. Therefore, as the "daily sacrifice" is connected with the "holy covenant," and was taken away from the "sanctuary of strength," "the holy place," or "the temple of God," to give place to "the abomination that maketh desolate," it is proved again that the "daily sacrifice" was or is the *true worship*.

It is shown also that the same "host" which transgressed "*against the daily sacrifice*" in chapter xii, is repre-

sented as *forsaking* the "holy covenant," which is quite sufficient proof of itself; for they could not *forsake* the "holy covenant," as everybody must know, without transgressing "against the *daily sacrifice*," or the true worship. Indeed, to make the "daily" sacrifice here, represent or mean "the continual heathen persecution or worship" as some do, would be to make the most utter confusion of the whole prophecy. The very fact that no such thing was ever taken away from the "holy place," "sanctuary," or "temple of God," proves the whole thing to be a very great and serious mistake."

We, therefore, without going further, consider this point settled forever, that the "daily sacrifice" that was to be taken away, by placing or setting up the abomination of desolation, is the true Christian worship.

The taking away of the "daily sacrifice," therefore, and the placing the "abomination that maketh desolate," is simply the taking away of the *true Christian faith and worship* and placing the *Catholic faith and worship* in its stead.

Having thus shown what is required to fulfill the prophecy under consideration, we shall next proceed to show by history when it was done. That it was most fully accomplished, in A. D. 532, the following from Bower's History of the Popes, vol. 1, p. 324, will very clearly show:

"For, by an edict; which he [Justinian] issued to unite all men in *one faith*, whether Jews, Gentiles or Christians, such as did not, in the term of *three months*, *embrace* and *profess* the *Catholic faith*, were declared to be *infamous*, and, as such, excluded from all employments, both civil and military, rendered incapable of leaving anything by will, and their estates confiscated, whether real or personal. These were convincing arguments of the truth of the Catholic faith. But many, however, withstood them; and against such as did, the imperial edict was executed with the **UTMOST RIGOR**. Great numbers were driven from their homes, with their wives and children, **STRIPPED and NAKED**. Others betook themselves to flight, carrying with them what they could conceal, for their support and maintenance; but they were plundered of the little they had, and many of them **INHUMANLY MASSACRED** by the *Catholic peasants and soldiery who guarded the passes*."

Here we see the most perfect fulfillment of the prediction. By this edict, the "daily sacrifice," or true worship, as we have shown it to be, was taken away, and the "abomination

of desolation," or the idolatrous worship of the Catholic church took its place.

That the Greek government is the power that was to "set up" the "abomination of desolation," and thus to commence the "*war with the saints*," is no longer a matter of dispute among Protestant expositors. The fact that it did do it, as the above history most clearly shows, settles the question that it was the power pointed out in prophecy to do it, since prophecy cannot have but one fulfillment.

If further proof is required to satisfy the reader on this point, it is found in the fact that the Greek government is *the one* and the *only one* that ever "*plucked up*," according to Daniel vii: 8, "three of the first horns" or kingdoms "by the roots"—the first of which, viz., the vandals, was "plucked up," in A. D. 533.

By the foregoing edict and history, it is shown that the union between the Greek empire and the Roman Catholic church was effected in 532, in the *highest sense* of the word.

The Roman Catholic *faith* and *worship* was established with *all the power* of the empire, since, as Bower says, "the imperial edict was executed with the **UTMOST RIGOR**."

This furnished the church of Christ with the utmost necessity to "flee to the mountains," leaving everything behind them, even to much of their ordinary clothing, as the Saviour had commanded them. It will be seen, by carefully reading the history in connection with the edict before given, that those who did not take strict heed to the Saviour's command, were arrested in their flight and "*inhumanly massacred*." To "flee to the mountains," on the occasion of this edict, was an absolute necessity to save their lives, since they were not only "turned out doors, stripped and naked," but they were excluded from all employment of every kind. Hence to remain in the empire was to perish in the open field by starvation.

The importance of praying, as our Saviour had commanded, that their flight might not be in the winter, is here very clearly seen. For if this three months had just covered the winter season, not a member of the Church could scarcely have escaped death. Flight in the winter, stripped and naked, would have been not only useless but impossible, as they would have perished in the attempt.

What more terrible law of persecution than this could be made? What could be more comprehensive? The Church of Christ being wholly exterminated, by death and banishment, from the empire, of course nothing more could be done.

Bower shows that the empire was guarded so closely by the "soldiery" and "Catholic peasants," that it was impossible for any one to escape them, with anything concealed about them, however careful they might have been in concealing it. Jesus, seeing this would be the case, instructed his disciples, on seeing the "abomination of desolation" "stand in the holy place," to "flee to the mountains," and not to come down from the house-top to "take *anything* out of the house," nor to turn back "in the field" to take their clothes.

Gibbon, in vol. 3, p. 265, in speaking of the "RIGOR" with which this edict was executed, says that, "*in the creed of Justinian, the guilt of murder could not be applied to the slaughter of unbelievers; and he piously labored to establish, with FIRE and SWORD, the unity of the Christian faith.*"

Again: "On the approach of the Catholic priests and soldiers, they grasped with alacrity the crown of martyrdom; the conventicle and the congregation perished in the flames."

Thus was this terrible law carried into effect, to the extermination of the church of Christ, by death and banishment, from the empire.

From this it will be seen that Daniel xi: 31—"And arms shall stand on his part, and they * * shall take away the daily sacrifice," &c., was most strikingly fulfilled.

The whole empire being guarded and traversed by the soldiery, accompanied by the Catholic priests, the "daily sacrifice," or true worship, was "taken away," and the "abomination of desolation," or the idolatrous worship of the "mother of harlots and abominations of the earth," took its place. The Church of Christ and the true worship were now no longer in the empire; and, for 1260 years from this date (532), this terribly bloody war on the saints continued—until, as we have shown in the two previous chapters, the spring of 1792, when "toleration of all religious worship" was established by France to the "fullest extent."

The last power that was to rise in the fulfillment of prophecy, according to Rev. xi: 7, and xvii: 10, 11, was to be an infidel power—was to "make war against" and "kill" Christ's "two witnesses," which none but an infidel power would do. This is positive proof that Infidel France is the last power that was to arise in the fulfillment of prophecy, since she is the only infidel power that has arisen in modern times. Therefore, when France established complete toleration of *all religious worship* in the beginning of 1792, the abomination of desolation ceased to stand in the holy place—the saints were no longer put to death for refusing to embrace and profess the

Catholic faith. There was no union between Infidel France and the Roman Catholic church, but, on the contrary, the Legislative Assembly decreed, on the 26th of May, 1792, the immediate banishment of every Roman ecclesiastic, without exception, who would not take the oath to the infidel constitution.

This put an end forever to the abomination of desolation. The abomination still existed, but it was powerless—it stood or ruled no longer in the holy place, and, therefore, it could no longer desolate the Church of God, because, as we have seen, all classes were guaranteed the free exercise of their religion.

Having now shown that the abomination of desolation was set up in A. D. 532, and that the 1260 years terminated in the fore part of 1792, therefore the 1335 years must end in the fore part of 1867.

We are satisfied that this will be cheering news to all who are “pilgrims and strangers,” in a scriptural sense, in the world. Therefore, let all such lift up their heads and shout for joy, for the light of eternal day is just gleaming, as it were, over yon distant hills and mountains, and will, in a few short months, burst upon us with all its eternal glory and excellence. O, ye pilgrims, awake! awake!! and rally around this glorious standard of truth.

A few days or months more, and the long dark night of *soil, sacrifice and weeping* will be over, and we shall stand with bodies like the most glorious body of Jesus, on the shore of immortal glory. We can well afford to labor, suffer, sacrifice and weep for such a hope as this? Remember, if you are idle or indifferent in the Master's cause, you cannot be saved. Let none deceive themselves in this matter. Let none shrink from the cross of this last glorious truth, if they would wear the crown of life when Jesus comes. Now is the time to make your *last sacrifice* on the *altar* of God's blessed truth.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PROPHECY OF THE TWO WITNESSES CLOTHED IN
SACKCLOTH.—REVELATION XI:

3. "And I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophecy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth."

4. "These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth."

5. "And if any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies: and if any man will hurt them, he must in this manner be killed."

6. "These have power to shut heaven, that it rain not in the days of their prophecy: and have power over waters to turn them to blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues, as often as they will."

7. "And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them."

The first question to settle here is, "What is a witness? It is one who gives *testimony*. Testimony is *oral*—that is, a witness testifies to what he knows, by *word of mouth*—or it is *written*. This last kind of testimony, in some cases, is stronger than oral. For example: You may produce twenty persons, in court, to prove my indebtedness to you, but if I can produce a receipt, in your hand-writing, that I have paid the alleged debt, your twenty witnesses fall before it, and their entire testimony is outweighed by this *one* witness." That these two witnesses are Christ's witnesses, there can be no doubt, in the mind of any. We therefore think it unnecessary to give proof, on this point.

The next question to settle is, "What are Christ's two witnesses?" (1.) "It is not one man, nor any body of men; for Christ declares, (John v: 34), 'I RECEIVE NOT TESTIMONY FROM MAN.'" With this plain declaration before us, how can any one longer insist on either the whole church, or a succession of pious ministers, or yet two eminent men who either have arisen, or will arise, as Christ's witnesses?

To claim that they are literal is to believe that they are "two olive trees and two candlesticks;" and further—that literal fire proceeds out of their mouths and literally burns up their enemies; and also that no literal rain falls during the days of their prophesying, which is quite sufficient evidence of itself, that they are not to be literally understood. The declaration of Christ himself—"I receive not testimony from man"—should be quite sufficient to settle the fact that no two men or body of men are meant.

(2.) "*What Christ said of himself is not his witness.*" John v: 31: "*If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.*" That is, if I only give my own assertions as to myself, my witness is not valid, or to be received as sufficient evidence.

(3.) "*John the Baptist is not THE witness of Christ.*" John v: 33-36: "Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth." "But I have greater witness than that of John." John was a burning and a shining light: he testified to the truth, but was a man, a fallible man still.

"But the witnesses are—

I. "THE WORKS OF CHRIST. John v: 36: '*For the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.*' The faithful evidence of those works we have in the gospel. This witness Christ also claims. Matt. xxiv: 14: '*This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a WITNESS to all nations.*'

II. "*The Father is another witness.* John v: 37: '*And THE FATHER HIMSELF, which hath sent me, hath BORNE WITNESS of me.*' But where is his witness? Christ answers, 'Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape;' and ye have not his word abiding in you.' Where, then, is the testimony? John v: 39: '*SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES: for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and THEY ARE THEY WHICH TESTIFY OF ME.*' A more distinct declaration of the two witnesses cannot be desired, or if desired, cannot be obtained.

"The Old Testament was all the scriptures which had been written, and hence must be the testimony of the Father to which the Saviour referred. The Old Testament was then complete, and the record of the works of Christ is to be found in the New Testament. These two witnesses have continued to testify and prophecy through the darkest night the Church has ever seen. They have been faithful and true witnesses of the Lord, telling the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."

Thus we may conclude from the above testimony, that THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS ARE THE TWO WITNESSES, which bring us to notice, in the *second* instance, their prophesying, *in sackcloth* for "a thousand two hundred and threescore days."

"This emblem is used for two purposes; the *first*, denotes sorrow, affliction, or mourning. It is so used frequently in the Old Testament. *Second*: It is also used to denote a state of obscurity and partial darkness.—Rev. vi: 12: "The sun became black as sackcloth of hair." Sackcloth of hair over the sun would not produce an entire obscuration; but a partial darkness. So the witnesses were to be partially darkened in the testimony they held. It was to be faithfully borne, but in a measure hid."

The Scriptures were in a state of obscurity, by being withheld by the Roman priesthood from the laity; also by their refusing to admit their translation into the vernacular language.

The following extract is from an eminent British writer—Dr. Croly:

"The Latin language, overwhelmed in the dialects of the Gothic invaders, had ceased to be spoken; the Latin scriptures were thus an unknown tongue, and the people, disturbed and impoverished by perpetual war, had neither time nor knowledge for their translation; the ignorance had reached the clergy, and the Pope, more of a warrior and a statesman than a priest, found that he could rise to dominion without the writings of prophet or apostle. *The Scriptures died out of the world's memory.* * * * Tyranny and bigotry loved darkness better than light, and strove to crush the gospel; *a code of the most furious persecution was established against all who dared to bring the Scriptures out of the dust,* and put a tongue into the dead; the gospels were trampled upon and destroyed; their readers were proscribed and exterminated; Rome, in the name of Christ, raged against the revelation that He had commanded with his last breath to be preached to every man under heaven."

That the two witnesses were clothed in sackcloth in A. D. 532, when the war began with the saints, there can be no doubt; for, as we have before shown, the Catholic faith and worship were established in that year, by the imperial edict of Justinian, to the fullest extent, by which the Catholic church was established as the only tolerated Church in the empire. No other doctrines were allowed to be taught in the empire, but the doctrines of the Catholic church; and no other teach-

ers or exponents of the Word of God were allowed, but the Catholic bishops and priests. Therefore, the Word of God was, by this edict, placed entirely in their hands, and thus its precious light was shut out from the world. The Church of Christ, everywhere massacred and banished from the empire, as we have shown in the three preceding chapters, the Word of God was thus shut up in the hands of the Catholic priests, and, consequently, at the same time in the dead languages. We are utterly unable to see how any prophecy could be more perfectly fulfilled than the foregoing.

From this, it is proved that the two witnesses began to prophecy, in sackcloth, at the same time the war began with the saints A. D. 532; for it was then the word of the Lord fell entirely into the hands of the Catholics. One thing inevitably follows the other. We now proceed to show the fulfillment of verses 7 to 10:

“And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them. And their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified. And they of the people, and kindreds, and tongues, and nations, shall see their dead bodies three days and a half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves. And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another; because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth.”

The beast from the bottomless pit is, beyond doubt, Atheistical France; and as the two witnesses were to prophecy for the definite period of one thousand two hundred and three-score days in a sackcloth state, they could not be slain until that period had terminated. Consequently 1260 years from A. D. 532, Faber, on the Prophecies, vol. 3, p. 363, says:

“On the memorable 26th of August, in the year 1792, an open profession of atheism, irreligion and infidelity was made, and forthwith acted upon, by a whole nation once devoted to the papal superstitions. Christianity was then formally abolished, as a notorious and malignant imposture by the government of revolutionary France; and so well did the people second them, that, while not a trace of the gospel could be found throughout the reprobate metropolis, every frantic oration in praise of atheism was loudly and enthusiastically applauded.”

Thus it is seen that the two witnesses were slain in 1792.

“*Where also our Lord was crucified.*” From this expression some may suppose that Jerusalem is meant, but we think, upon a brief examination, the fallacy of this view will appear. We must remember that we are not dealing with literalities. The city where this event occurs is “*spiritually* called Sodom and Egypt.” Sodom was noted for its *licentiousness*, and Egypt for its *infidelity*; thus, as both these characteristics were pre-eminently found in France, it was fitly symbolized by these two places. But, again, France had been one of the most bitter persecutors of the saints—the mystical body of Christ—and in putting to death the saints of Christ she had virtually crucified our Lord. This is shown at the conversion of Saul, where Jesus said unto him, “Saul, Saul, why persecuteth thou *me*?” thus recognizing the fact that “as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.” Again, Paul speaks of a class who “have crucified unto themselves the Son of God *afresh* and put him to an open shame,” which was most effectually done in France in 1792.

To show the reader that Infidel France was fitly symbolized by the beast out of the bottomless pit, and, therefore, was the power that was to slay the two witnesses, we here subjoin the following historical extracts. The first is from Smith’s Key to Revelation :

“THE TERRIBLE REPUBLIC—(the name they assumed before they became an empire)—having by *public authority denied God* and the Christian religion, were prepared to patronize any and every enormity: *the burning of the BIBLE in a PUBLIC PLACE*; the parading of the sacramental vessels through the streets on an ASS, in contempt; posting in their places of burial, ‘*Death is an eternal sleep*’; abolishing the Sabbath, and shutting up the houses of God; declaring Christ an *imposter*—the Gospel a forgery; and swearing to extirpate CHRISTIANITY from the world; assuring the public as follows: ‘Man, when free, wants no other DIVINITY *than himself*. REASON DETHRONES BOTH THE KINGS OF EARTH AND THE KING OF HEAVEN. *No monarchy above, if we wish to preserve our REPUBLIC BELOW.* Every other than a republic of ATHEISM is a *chimera*. If you *admit the existence of a Heavenly Sovereign*, you introduce the wooden horse; what you adore by day will be your ruin by night.’ ”

* * * * *

“A comedian, as a PRIEST of illuminism, publicly at-

tacked God thus: "No, THOU DOST NOT EXIST! If Thou hast power over the thunderbolts, grasp them and aim them at the man who dares set *Thee at defiance* in the face of Thine altars! But no!—I blaspheme Thee, and yet I live. No, THOU DOST NOT EXIST!"

Thus the atheistical beast from the bottomless pit made war on the two witnesses and their Author. For our own part we cannot conceive of a more perfect fulfillment.

But let us for a moment take into account the loss of life as reported by "General Denican, a French officer—that three millions of the French perished within the five years of the Revolution."

"This execrable power (says Mr. Keitt), which alone can steel the hearts of its votaries against every feeling of nature, has dared to sanction treason, parricide, lust, massacre; and to infuse into the breasts of its subject multitudes, a new passion, which has sunk them beneath the level of the brute creation—a passion for the sight of their fellow creatures in the agonies of death—a literal thirst for blood. * * * This is the power that, first enthroning seven hundred tyrants in the place of one king, ruled twenty-five millions of slaves with the iron sceptre of terror, and for five years made France a slaughter-house."

We will conclude this point by an extract from a work by Dr. Coke, LL. D., published in A. D. 1807:

"The massacre, in cold blood, of prisoners of war; the condemnation of persons accused, without the form of trial, or proof of guilt, are unhappily not without too many examples in the records of human depravity; but the conflagration of eighteen hundred and twenty towns, villages and hamlets, in one portion of its territory; the deliberate assassination of women and children by thousands; the horrid pollution of female victims, expiring in the agonies of death; and the establishment of *a tanyard under the auspices of the government, for manufacturing into leather the skins of its murdered citizens*—are facts and deeds of atrocity which exclusively disgrace the bloody annals of modern France, and give to the revolution a dreadful pre-eminence in guilt."

The Commissioner, Garnier, wrote to the Convention: "I have caused fifty-eight priests to be drowned; eighty priests have just been brought before me; I have drowned them, which has given me great pleasure."

Let us now proceed to notice the literal fulfillment of the 10th verse:

"And they that dwell upon the earth shall rejoice over

them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another; because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth."

One of the most astonishing features during the "Reign of Terror," was the fact, that in the midst of the most intense suffering, wretchedness and woe, those demons incarnate excelled any previous age of France in voluptuousness and sensuality. Dr. Croly remarks:

"A very remarkable and prophetic distinction of this period was the spirit of frenzied festivity which seized upon France; the capital and all the republican towns were the scene of feasts, processions and shows of the most extravagant kind; the most festive times of peace, under the most expensive kings, were thrown into the shade by the frequency, variety, and extent of the republican exhibitions; yet this was a time of perpetual miseries throughout France; the guillotine was bloody from morn till night. In the single month of July, 1794, nearly eight hundred persons, the majority principal individuals of the State, and all possessing some respectability of station, were guillotined in Paris."

Dr. Thomas Coke, LL. D., page 187, says:

"To prevent, in the midst of these commotions, every symptom of returning remorse, and to banish reflection from every bosom, the minds of the Parisians were kept in a continual fever of the most dissolute gaiety. 'Between the 10th of August, 1792, and the 1st of January, 1794,' says Robison, 'upwards of two hundred new plays were acted in the Parisian theatres. Their immorality and their barbarism exceeded all conception. All the voluptuous sensuality of ancient Rome was brought upon the stage. No decoration was spared, that could dazzle the eye; and the dialogues and representations were calculated for inflaming the passions, and nourishing the hatred of all subordination.' This strange chaos of voluptuousness and murder must have been at once an effect and a cause of a depraved state of morals."

Thus, dear reader, we have the most conclusive testimony concerning the perfect fulfillment of this prophecy thus far. But there was, also, a most astonishing fulfillment of the 13th verse, concerning the fall of one-tenth part of the city. The Revelator, in verse 18 of chapter 17, declares the woman to be that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth.

France was one of the original ten divisions of the Roman empire. It had also been, previous to the revolution of 1792, one of the most bigoted, cruel, intolerant, persecuting nations the Protestants had to suffer from. But how mysterious the

(7A)

change; the political earthquake of that memorable year upheaved both the political and ecclesiastical institutions of that Roman Catholic country from their foundations; and as Bower, vol. 3, p. 413, declares: "They therefore passed a decree, May 26, 1792, commanding the immediate banishment of every ecclesiastic, without exception, who would not take the civic oath." Thus the following prediction was most definitely accomplished:

13. "And the same hour was there a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city fell, and in the earthquake were slain of men seven thousand: and the remnant were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of Heaven."

It reads in the margin—"In the earthquake were slain *names of men* seven thousand."

The Constituent Assembly of the atheistical beast out of the bottomless pit, expunged all the titles of the king, queen, princes and nobility, in the political element: and also in the religious element they swept out of existence all their distinctive appellations, arch-bishops, bishops, priests, and all the various orders of monks, friars, nuns, &c., &c

Thus all the political and ecclesiastical dignitaries had their titles ruined by the earthquake of 1792. Thus terminated "the second woe:" and there, beyond the possibility of a doubt, terminated the 1260 days or years. And now, adding seventy-five years to the 1260, it makes the one thousand three hundred and five and thirty days (years) of Daniel xii, which will end in 1867, which brings the resurrection of the dead, and changes all the pure in heart from mortal to immortality.

O, how striking the coincidence!—that in A. D. 532, Justinian, the Greek emperor, a bigoted Roman Catholic, should issue an edict breathing persecution and slaughter against all but Romanists; and just 1260 years from the above date, a nation should revoke such an infamous law, and hurl the thunderbolts of atheistical vengeance against the wicked apostate harlot, drunk with the blood of the saints and the martyrs of Jesus.

Referring to the above event, the Hon. Gerard Noel says: "Can the overthrow of the monastic orders, plunder of the church property, the destruction of religion by legislative enactment, and the massacre of a hundred thousand of her clergy, be consistent with any reasonable estimate of domination and power? Under such terrific judgments upon the persecutor, can we refuse to admit that the period of the twelve hundred and sixty years has terminated its course?"

There cannot exist a doubt, it seems to us, concerning the commencement and the end of this most important period. It was, beyond a doubt, designed by our Heavenly Father to furnish His dear saints with a knowledge of the time. There was an interrogatory connected with it, in Daniel xii, and also a promise that the *wise* should understand. This same class are presented in a parable by our Lord, and represented as taking oil in their vessels with their lamps, and are called by our Saviour *wise virgins*. Also in Matthew xxiv: 45—"Who then is a faithful and *wise* servant, whom his Lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? Blessed is that servant whom his Lord, when He cometh, shall find so doing." Amen.

We now close this chapter with an entreaty, to all that may read it, to prepare to meet their Judge. The closing scenes of this world's history are now passing before the eye of faith. Dear reader, the last day will soon be upon us; the last heir will soon, very soon, be sealed for the kingdom, and God will rise to shake terribly the earth.

CHAPTER VII.

THE HOLY CITY TRODDEN UNDER FOOT.

Revelations, chapter xi: 1, 2: "And there was given me a reed like unto a rod: and the angel stood, saying, Rise and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein. But the court which is without the temple leave out, and measure it not; for it is given unto the Gentiles: and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months."

The holy city evidently represents the true church. Some have, and do still, understand the holy city to be Jerusalem; but this view is shown to be incorrect, from the fact that Jerusalem has never been trodden under foot by the "Gentiles," just forty-two months, either in literal or symbolic time; nor was it to be so; for the Saviour declared, in the 21st chapter of Luke, that Jerusalem should "be trodden down of the Gentiles," from its destruction, by the Romans, to the end of Gentile times. To say that the holy city should be trodden under foot forty-two months, is to say that it should be trodden under foot so long, and no longer, which can, in no sense, be affirmed of Jerusalem. And, further, Jerusalem, since its overthrow by the Romans, can, in no sense, be said to be a holy city. Moreover, as the temple of God cannot be the literal temple in Jerusalem (for that was destroyed over eighteen hundred years ago), so the holy city cannot be the literal city of Jerusalem. That the holy city is a symbol of the true church, is further proved, from the fact that in chapter xvii: 18, and in chapter xviii: 10-16, we find, as is admitted by all the Protestant commentators, that the Catholic church is represented by an *unholy city*, or "that great city, Babylon." Now, it must be evident to the reader, that if one city (the latter) represents the apostate church, the holy city must represent the true church, and *vice versa*.

The next question is, who are to tread the holy city under foot? Ans.—The "Gentiles;" that is, those Gentile kings, "who," in the language of prophecy, have committed fornication with the apostate woman—the Catholic church. This position is proved, from the following considerations: In the

1st verse of the 17th chapter, the apostate woman is represented as sitting "upon many waters;" and, in the 15th verse, the "many waters" are interpreted to mean "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues." The 16th chapter, verses 5 and 6, read as follows: "And I heard the angel of the WATERS say, Thou art righteous, O! Lord, which art, and wast, and shall be, because thou hast judged thus." "For they," that is, the "waters," "have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them," that is, "the waters," "blood to drink." Thus we have positively proved, by the word of God, that it was not the apostate woman which "shed the blood of the saints," but it was the *waters*, upon which she sat, and, by consequence, those nations or kings which committed fornication with her [chapter xvii: 1, 2], as symbolized by the seven-headed beast like a leopard of chapter xiii.

From the foregoing facts and considerations it will be seen that the treading under foot of the holy city by the Gentiles, is simply nothing more or less than the making "*war with the saints*" by the beast like a leopard of chapter xiii. And having fully established this fact, for the sake of brevity, we refer the reader for further evidence and for all the facts in history on this subject to the third, fourth and fifth chapters of this work.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE "WOMAN" FED AND "NOURISHED" IN "THE WILDERNESS" "A THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND THREESCORE DAYS" "FROM THE FACE OF THE SERPENT."—Revelation xii: 6, 14.

This we regard as one of the most beautiful and important portions of prophecy, on the subject of the time of the coming of our blessed Lord, in the Bible. We therefore invite the especial attention of the reader to the following exposition:

Verse 1. "And there appeared a great wonder in Heaven: a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars."

That the woman here brought to view is a symbol, is so universally admitted, that to give proof of it, seems to us unnecessary. It further seems unnecessary to prove that the woman, *in the beginning of her career*, represented the true Church, as this, we are satisfied, will readily be admitted by all.

The question which we wish to examine and settle, more particularly, is this: What did the woman represent at the time she obtained "the two wings of a great eagle" [verse 14], with which, or by which, she flew into the wilderness? The importance of understanding this correctly is seen from the fact that it was the woman which flew into the wilderness, that was fed and nourished "a thousand two hundred and three-score days" "from the face of the serpent." The time, therefore, when she began to be fed and nourished, must have had a definite beginning, or it could not have marked the commencement of a definite period. Mark, the point is where she began to be fed and "nourished from the face of the serpent." The question which we first wish here to settle is: What are we to understand by the *wilderness*? Is it *literal* or *symbolic*? We answer symbolic, from the following reasons: 1. The woman is, and must be admitted to be, a symbol; 2. Therefore, the "two wings of a great eagle" given to her, must be symbolic; 3. By consequence, her flying with those wings into the wilderness, must be symbolic

lying; 4. And, therefore, the wilderness into which she thus symbolically flies, must be a symbol also. We shall give further evidence on this point soon.

It will be seen, by the 14th verse, that the addition of the "two wings of a great eagle" to the woman, represents, or symbolizes, something added, or given, to the Church, during her progress down the stream of time, which she did not possess at the beginning; and, as she flew with those wings, they must represent an acquisition of worldly influence and power.

The following, from Dr. Clarke's Commentary, beautifully explains this part of the prophecy :

" 'And to the woman were given two wings of a great eagle.' 'The great eagle,' here mentioned, is an emblem of the Roman empire, in general; and, therefore, differs from the dragon, which is a symbol of the HEATHEN ROMAN empire, in particular. The Roman power is called an *eagle*, from its legionary standard, which was introduced among the Romans, in the second year of the consulate of Caius Marius; for before that time minotaurs, wolves, leopards, horses, boars and eagles were used indifferently, according to the humor of the commander. The Roman eagles were figures in relieve, of silver or gold, borne on the tops of pikes, the wings being displayed, and frequently a thunderbolt in their talons. Under the eagle, on the pike, were piled bucklers, and sometimes crowns. The two wings of the great eagle refer to the *two grand independent* divisions of the Roman empire, which took place January 17, A. D. 395, and were given to the woman, Christianity being the established religion of both empires."

It is evident from this, that the two wings of the great eagle represented the two grand divisions of the Roman empire [Eastern and Western], the influence and support of which were given to the woman, about 395. The woman having thus obtained the two wings of the great eagle, she rapidly flew into the wilderness, where we shall soon find her, with such a particular description of her general appearance, as will leave no doubt as to who she is. But we first wish to notice some other points in the prophecy, respecting her, before coming directly to this point.

It will be seen, from the character of the two wings of the great eagle, that they represent the woman, or the Church, at the time she obtained them, as beginning, according to St. Paul [2d Thess. ii: 3], to fall away. And it is a fact, universally known and admitted, among all Protestant expositors, that the Church began to fall away from the truth and sim-

God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ;" therefore, the woman that flew into the wilderness represented the Catholic church. Further evidence that the woman which fled into the wilderness represented the Catholic church will be found in the 17th chapter.

In verse 3, of this chapter, John says: "So he carried me away, in the spirit, into the wilderness." Well, John, what did you see when you got into the wilderness? "And I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet-colored beast." Verse 4: "And the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet-color, and decked with gold, and precious stones, and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and the filthiness of her fornication." Verse 5: "AND UPON HER FOREHEAD WAS A NAME WRITTEN, MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH." Verse 6: "And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus; and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration."

From the above description, we can have no difficulty in deciding who the woman was that flew into the wilderness. The wilderness is here clearly proved to be a symbol, for the Catholic church was never in the wilderness in any other sense. The wilderness, then, belongs to the Catholic church, as a symbol of her utter destitution, or barrenness, of the grace of God, and of true religion. John tells us, virtually, that there was but one woman that flew into the wilderness, and she flew there by means of the "two wings of a great eagle;" so that we cannot be mistaken that the woman which he afterward saw in the wilderness, was the one that flew there with the said wings. The wilderness being a symbol, it will be seen that it cannot possibly apply to the true Church, or remnant, during the 1260 years, as it can only symbolize the condition of an apostate Church.

The true Church, at this time, as we have already shown, instead of being *fed* and *nourished from the face of the serpent*, was trodden under foot, during the whole period. The remnant did not fly, because they had no wings. Besides, the woman flew from the face of the dragon, while the true Church, if she flew at all (which she did not), flew from the face of the "beast like a leopard." All these facts prove, most positively, that the woman "fed" and "nourished" in the "wilderness," "from the face of the serpent," was the Roman Catholic church.

We have shown, in chap. i, that the dragon, or serpent, can

only symbolize pagans, or infidels, for such the pagans always were. A believer in Christ or the Bible, however false his faith or religion may be, cannot be represented by a serpent. As Dr. Clarke justly remarks, the dragon represented the "heathen," that is, the infidel, "Roman empire," and not the Christian. The serpent in the garden of Eden was infidel to the word of God, and, therefore, was made a symbol of heathen or infidel nations—those nations and peoples that deny the word of God. This once understood, and all will be clear and certain, as to the time when the Catholic church began to be fed and nourished from the face of the serpent; for the serpent here cannot be said to be, in any sense, the literal Devil, since no Church, whether true or false, has ever been, or ever was to be, fed and nourished just 1260 years, from the face of the literal Devil.

In showing the beginning of this period, we shall quote the same extracts which we have so frequently quoted before. But they will now be read with a new interest, as we shall quote them to show a new phase of prophecy, and which they will show, most clearly. We would simply remark here, however, before giving them, that for pagan, or infidel, the historian generally, as will be seen, uses the term Gentile. Hence the phrase "Jews, Gentiles and Christians." The term GENTILE, therefore, only applies to those who are neither professed Jews or Christians, and, therefore, are professed heathens, or infidels, and, as such, are represented by the serpent. With this explanation, we now introduce the following, from Bower, vol. 1, p. 334:

"For, by an edict which he (Justinian) issued, to unite all men in one faith, whether Jews, GENTILES, or Christians, such as did not, in the term of three months, embrace and profess the Catholic faith, were declared infamous; and, as such, excluded from all employments, both civil and military, rendered incapable of leaving anything by will, and their estates confiscated, whether real or personal. These were convincing arguments of the truth of the Catholic faith; but many, however, withstood them; and against such as did, the imperial edict was executed with the UTMOST RIGOR. Great numbers were driven from their homes, with their wives and children, *stripped and naked. Others betook themselves to flight, carrying with them what they could conceal, for their support and maintenance; but they were plundered of the little they had, and many of them inhumanly massacred by the Catholic peasants, or the soldiery, who guarded the passes.*"

It is shown, by the above history, that the GENTILES,

those represented by the serpent, were embraced in the edict of Justinian, as well as the Jews and Christians; and no class was more effectually suppressed than they were. Everywhere, throughout the whole empire, as Gibbon will soon tell us, the Gentiles were compelled to embrace, and openly profess, by baptism, the Catholic faith. Thus the Gentiles, or pagans, being baptized into the Catholic church, in A. D. 532, and thus covered up, under a false profession of Christianity, the face of the serpent no longer appeared to the woman, or the Catholic church; and paganism, or the pagan worship, was no more to be found. The Greek empire not only put an end to the pagan worship in 532, but it took the support of the Church under its care.

We now call attention to the following, from Gibbon, vol. 3, pp. 264, 265, which will show the *entire suppression* of the pagan worship, or the face, or external appearance of the serpent, in the Greek empire, in 532. Says Gibbon:

"The reign of Justinian was a uniform, yet various scene of persecution, and he appears to have surpassed his indolent predecessors, both in the contrivance of his laws and the rigor of their execution. The insufficient term of three months was assigned for the conversion or exile of ALL HERETICS.

* * * At the end of four hundred years, the Montanists of Phrygia still breathed the wild enthusiasms of perfection and prophecy, which they had imbibed from their male and female apostles, the special organs of the Paraclete. On the approach of the CATHOLIC PRIESTS and SOLDIERS, they grasped with alacrity the crown of martyrdom; the conventicle and the congregation perished in the flames. * *

* A secret remnant of PAGANS, who still lurked in the most refined and the most rustic conditions of mankind, excited the indignation of the Christians, who were perhaps unwilling that any strangers should be the witness of their intestine quarrels. A bishop was named as the inquisitor of the faith, and his diligence soon discovered in the court and city, the magistrates, lawyers, physicians and sophists, who still cherished the superstitions of the Greeks [pagans]. They were sternly informed that they must choose, without delay, between the displeasure of Jupiter and Justinian, and that their AVERSION to the GOSPEL could no longer be disguised under the scandalous mask of indifference or impiety. The patrician Photius, perhaps alone, was resolved to live and die like his ancestors: he enfranchised himself with the stroke of a dagger, and left his tyrant the poor consolation of exposing with ignominy the lifeless corpse of the fugitive. His weaker

brethren submitted to their earthly monarch, underwent the ceremony of baptism, and labored by their extraordinary zeal, to erase the suspicion, or to expiate the guilt of idolatry. The native country of Homer, and the theatre of the Trojan war, still retained the last spark of his mythology: by the care of the same bishop, *seventy thousand pagans* were detected and converted in Asia, Phrygia, Lydia and Caria; ninety-six churches were built for the new proselytes; and linen vestments, bibles and liturgies, and vases of gold and silver, were supplied by the pious munificence of Justinian."

A more beautiful and remarkable fulfillment of prophecy, we do not believe, can be found on the pages of history, than is here shown.

By the foregoing history, it will be seen that, under the edict of Justinian, the pagans, throughout the empire, as represented by the serpent, were baptized into the Catholic church, under which circumstance he no longer appeared as a serpent, but as a Christian, according to the Catholic faith and worship. Of course, those pagans thus forcibly baptized into the Catholic faith and worship, under the penalties of the edict of Justinian, in 532, were, at heart, as much pagans, or infidels, after their baptism, as they were before. But they did not dare show their face as such; that is, they did not dare to make any open profession of paganism; for says Gibbon, in speaking of the rigor with which Justinian executed his edict in 532, "he piously labored to establish with fire and sword the unity of the Christian faith."

This put an effectual end to paganism; and thus the Catholic church began to be *fed* and *nourished*, "in the wilderness" of her apostacy, from the face of the serpent, in A. D. 532, and thus continued, as we shall see presently, for 1260 years. We shall now leave this point, and pass down to 1792, at the end of the 1260 years, where, we think, we shall find such a manifestation of the serpent, again, as will leave no doubt, in the mind of the reader, that the woman is no longer fed and nourished, from his face.

We have already shown, in other chapters, that Infidel or Atheistical France was the beast "out of the bottomless pit;" and, as such, was represented by the dragon, or serpent, upon the principles before shown. But France is called a beast, says one, perhaps. Precisely so. Dr. Adam Clarke, in commenting upon the dragon of chapter xii, in answer to the question, "But what is a dragon?" says: "an entirely fabulous BEAST of antiquity." Dr. Adam Clarke is certainly good authority, on this point, and shows that a dragon is a

(8A)

beast; and, in said chapter, dragon and serpent are shown to be synonymous terms: France, from having established atheism, by law, was a dragon, in the highest, and, as will soon be shown, the *most terrible* sense of the term. But in what sense did Atheistical France come out of the "bottomless pit?" We answer, by making an open profession of paganism—infidelity—by establishing atheism by law. France, before 1791 and 1792, had been, like other nations of Europe, a professed Catholic Christian nation—had been covered up, under the cover of the profession of the false doctrines of the Catholic church; was nestled, as it were, covered over with her false doctrines of Christianity, in her very bosom; so that, when France threw off this false covering, or profession of the Catholic faith and worship, which can only properly be symbolized by a bottomless pit, and came out in an open profession of infidelity, or atheism, she was, in the fullest sense of the term, the dragon out of the bottomless pit. The doctrines of the Catholic church are *bottomless*, because they have no foundation in truth, and, therefore, they have no foundation at all. And whatever may be said of the doctrines of the Catholic church, may be said of the Catholic church herself; so that the Catholic church is *really* the bottomless pit of Revelation. Hence, she is thus called, virtually, in chapter xix: 2, which reads as follows: "Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the *habitation of devils*" (serpents), "and the hole of every *foul spirit*, and the cage of every unclean and hateful bird." Of course, the devil here, is no more to be understood literally, than the "unclean and hateful birds" are. The same rule of interpretation must apply in both cases. Therefore, the devil here is the same as the dragon, that old serpent, and the devil, in 12th chapter. Thus the Catholic church is proved to be the "bottomless pit" of Revelation, as well as the "woman" and the "great city Babylon."

From this it will be seen that the Catholic church fulfills, at least, three symbols; 1, the woman in the wilderness; 2, the great city Babylon; 3, the bottomless pit. France, therefore, was the beast out of the bottomless pit, in 1792, because France, at that time, ascended out of the Catholic church, by an open profession of atheism, which she established, by law, at that time, as we have before shown.

This being settled, no one can doubt, for a moment, that the woman (the Catholic church) ceased to be fed and nourished from the face of the serpent, at the very latest, in 1792. For, as we have before abundantly proved, the Infidel French

republic—the serpent out of the bottomless pit—literally devoured her alive.

To give all our readers a clear statement of the results of the infidel revolution in France, to the Catholic church, we shall here insert the following extracts, from Goodrich's and Marsh's Church and Ecclesiastical Histories. Says Goodrich, pp. 183, 184:

"At the commencement of the French revolution, the clergy in France were both numerous and wealthy. They amounted to no less than eighteen Archbishops, one hundred and eleven Bishops, and one hundred and fifty thousand priests, having under their control a revenue of five millions sterling, annually, besides three thousand four hundred convents. The clergy and their wealth were now attacked by the INFIDEL revolutionists, and fell an easy prey. The tithes and revenues of the clergy were taken away, by a decree of the Constituent Assembly; the possessions of the Church were now declared to be the property of the nation; the religious orders abolished, the monks and nuns ejected from their convents, and their immense wealth seized for the nation. The revolutionary torrent, which was thus set in motion, destroyed law, government and religion in France, and laid waste the ROMAN CHURCH, both there and in neighboring countries. The priests were massacred, her silver shrines and saints were turned into money for the payment of the troops, her bells were converted into cannon, and her churches and convents into barracks for soldiers. From the Atlantic to the Adriatic she presented but one appalling spectacle. She had shed the blood of saints and prophets, and God now gave her blood to drink."

Says Marsh, p. 300: "A civil constitution was formed for the clergy, to which all were required to swear, on pain of death or banishment. The great body refused, and priest and altar were overturned, and blood, once esteemed sacred, flowed to the horses' bridles. Such as could, escaped through a thousand dangers, and found an asylum in foreign countries. No tongue can tell the woes of the nation."

Says Bower's History of the Popes, vol. 3, p. 414:

"They [the Legislative Assembly] therefore passed a decree May 26th, 1792, COMMANDING THE IMMEDIATE BANISHMENT OF EVERY ECCLESIASTIC, WITHOUT EXCEPTION, WHO WOULD NOT TAKE THE CIVIC OATH."

Reader, with these facts before you, how can you doubt, for a moment, that the 1260 years of Revelation, ended in the French revolution, as early as the 26th of May, 1792? Was

the woman, or the Catholic church, fed and nourished from the face of the serpent after that date?

Says the Hon. Gerard Noel:

"Can the overthrow of the monastic orders, plunder of the church property, the destruction of religion by legislative enactment, and the massacre of a hundred thousand of her clergy, be consistent with any reasonable estimate of domination and power? Under such terrific judgments upon the persecutors, can we refuse to admit that the period of the 1260 years has terminated its course?"

Thus we have established, by the most positive evidence, that the 1260 years began in 532, and, by consequence, the 1335 days, or years, must end by about the 26th of May, 1867. From 1792 the blood of the Catholic church flowed, by the serpent power of France, throughout Europe, or, to use the language of the historian, "from the Atlantic to the Adriatic." Thus was God's word faithfully fulfilled. "They shall feed her there a thousand two hundred and three-score days, from the face of the serpent," says inspiration, thus showing that the Catholic church was to be both supported and protected from the infidel, or serpent power, just 1260 years. But where was the power that supported and protected her from the infidel, or serpent power in 1792? Answer—Nowhere.

Who can doubt, for a moment, that the serpent-power of France, like the Medes and Persians, at the overthrow of ancient Babylon, was used as an instrument, by God, to execute his terrible judgments upon that blood-thirsty Church?

We have now proved, beyond question, that the 1260 years ended in the beginning or fore part of 1792, and therefore the 1335 days, or years, will end at the same time in 1867, praise the Lord. O, ye pilgrims, lift up your heads and rejoice. The night of weeping is about ended. A few more months and the long absent One will be here, and will wipe all the tears from our eyes, and put an end to death, sorrow, pain and crying forever and ever. Amen.

THE THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND NINETY DAYS.

This period was given, in the prophecy of Daniel, clearly as a measurement of what our Saviour calls, in Matthew xxiv: 21, the "great tribulation;" for in Daniel xii: 9, 11, it is shown that the 1290 days, beginning with the setting up of

the abomination of desolation, terminated, *definitely*, at the "time of the end." In verse 9, Daniel was informed that the "words," that is, the oath of the angel, in verse 7, was "closed up and sealed till the time of the end." This is the ONLY point given in the prophecy, in connection with the 1290 days, after the setting up of the abomination of desolation, which marks their beginning. Therefore, when he (the angel) says "from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days," he virtually says that there shall be, from that point, "a thousand two hundred and ninety days," "till the time of the end;" for, most certainly, the point to which the 1290 days extend, must be clearly given somewhere in the prophecy, and, by consequence, as there is no other point given, it must be "the time of the end." We trust this is sufficiently clear, to satisfy the reader.

Now, in chapter xi: 31-35, it is shown that the "saints" were to "fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil," from the time when the "abomination that maketh desolate" should be placed or "set up," "even to the time of the end"—the "time appointed." Hence, the "great tribulation," according to Daniel, was to be "a thousand two hundred and ninety days," or years, long. But our Saviour said, over four hundred years subsequent to Daniel's prophecy, as recorded in Matthew xxiv: 22, that "THOSE DAYS *shall be shortened*"—"And except THOSE DAYS *should be shortened*, there should *no flesh* BE SAVED; but for the *elect's sake* THOSE DAYS *shall be shortened*." What days? Why, the days of the "GREAT TRIBULATION," and, therefore, as we have shown, the 1290 days. Let it be observed, that it is not the tribulation of those days, which the Saviour says "shall be shortened," but it is "THOSE DAYS"—"but for the elect's sake, THOSE DAYS *shall be shortened*." Of course, if those days (the 1290) which were given to measure the "great tribulation," are shortened, the tribulation itself, must be shortened also.

That this shortening of those days did actually take place, is proved from the fact that when Jesus gave the Revelation to John, he gave as the measurement of the "great tribulation" 1260 days, instead of the 1290, and thus carried out his declaration, in Matthew xxiv: 22.

That God has the sovereign right to alter or change a given period, is clearly proved in the case of Hezekiah (Isa. xxxviii) and of Ninevah. In the first case, he lengthened the time fif-

teen years, and in the second case, he lengthened the time from forty days to over forty years. "Now, if God had the sovereign right to add to a term of time, he can, by virtue of the same divine right, abridge its length, or shorten the days. That He reserves to Himself that right is evident, from the fact that Jesus declares they "shall be shortened." Observe, He does not say that for the elect's sake, the tribulation shall be shortened, but "for the elect's sake, those days shall be shortened." It may be inquired, was not the tribulation itself shortened? Certainly: but can the tribulation be cut short without shortening the days that measure that tribulation? Were it even possible to do this, it would not coincide with our Saviour's words; for it was His explicit declaration that the days should be shortened. Therefore, we should still have to look to a fulfillment by shortening the days."

But for whose sake shall they be shortened? Answer—"For the elect's sake, whom he hath chosen." (Mark xiii: 20.) Who are the elect? Answer—"The children of God," those who should be "HATED of all nations for his name's sake," which could, in no sense, be applied to the unbelieving Jews.

"Those days must, of necessity, have a given length, or they could not, with propriety, be said to be shortened. If a merchant, for example, should employ an individual in his service, and in their contract a specific time for his services should be agreed upon, it would be in their power either to lengthen or shorten that term of time; but without a definite number of days being specified, we can conceive of no propriety in the idea of either lengthening or shortening the period. And how a rational mind can entertain the idea of shortening an indefinite number of days, we are unable to comprehend. The word 'shorten' is defined by Webster thus: '*To make short in measure, extent or time; as to shorten distance; to shorten a road, to shorten days of calamity.*' (Matt. xxiv.) Shortened is defined thus: '*Make short or shorter; abridged; contracted.*' "

We have already shown, by undisputed facts in history, that the tribulation upon the church of Christ terminated in 1792, just 1260 years from where it began—532—that the tribulation of 1792 was visited upon the Catholic church, with all the terrible consequences that it had been visited upon the church of Christ, during any part of the 1260 years preceding, which could not have been the case if that period had not previously ended; for the tribulation of the 1260 years was to be WHOLLY upon the saints. As in the case of typical Babylon, so it was

to be in the case of antitypical Babylon. In the case of the former, the seventy years had to run out before Babylon—the type—could be overthrown. So the 1260 years had to run out, before Babylon—the antitype—could be overthrown. That the reign of that apostate city, (church,) “and the kings of the earth,” were entirely overthrown in 1792, we have already proved, beyond question or doubt. The beast out of the bottomless pit was FULLY organized. Thus, the war upon the saints, by the “beast like a leopard,” which constituted the “great tribulation,” was inevitably out at that time. Therefore, we have proved that those days (1290) were shortened just 30 days, to 1260. This, we think, is all we need to say on the 1290 days, to satisfy the reader that they were shortened to 1260.

CHAPTER IX.

EXPOSITION OF THE DRAGON, AND THE THOUSAND YEARS OF REV. XX.

Before commencing this exposition, we wish to make a few prefatory remarks. This is, unquestionably, a very interesting subject; and it will be seen, before we get through with it, we think, to be an important one concerning the time of the coming of the Lord. This statement will probably be quite startling to some, who may think it little short of infidelity to place the thousand years anywhere else than in the future. But so sure as the previous expositions of this book are true, so true the thousand years are in the past, and ended with the 1260 years in the French Revolution. This we think we shall be able to prove beyond question, to the satisfaction of the reader, if they will but waive all preconceived notions for a short time, and come with us directly to the word of the Lord.

We have seen, in the previous chapter, that the dragon, or serpent, was cast into the bottomless pit, in the Greek empire, by being *baptized* into the Catholic church, in A. D. 532; that from this point to the time when he ascended out, in the French Revolution, was 1260 years, during which time the *woman* of chapters xii and xvii was *fed* and *nourished* from the *face* of the *serpent*, simply from the fact that he was, in the Greek empire, from that date, in the "bottomless pit," or covered up with a false profession of Christianity, under the penalties of the Justinian edict. The 1260 years, then, measure from the time when the dragon was cast into the bottomless pit, in the Greek empire in the east; while the 1000 years, as we shall see, measure from the time when the dragon was cast into the bottomless pit, in the Roman empire in the west. And if we have been able, by divine grace, to show a clear and unmistakable fulfillment in the case of the former, we think, by the aid of the same grace, we shall be equally able to succeed in showing the same in the case of the latter. We shall

answer the various objections that might be urged to this exposition as we go along.

We earnestly request the readers, however, if they have not already done so, to first read the previous chapter on the "woman" in the "wilderness," as they will then be much better prepared to comprehend the subject under consideration. We also ask the indulgence and patience of the reader as we take up and settle each point in the order given in the chapter. With these remarks, we shall now commence the exposition :

"1. And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand.

"2. And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, and bound him a thousand years.

"3. And cast him into the bottomless pit, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, that he should deceive the nations no more, till the thousand years should be fulfilled ; and after that he must be loosed a little season.

"4. And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them ; and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their forehead, or in their hands ; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years."

In giving an exposition of these verses, we shall take up each item separately in the order given.

I. As to the "angel" which "came down from heaven." Is this angel Christ, as is generally supposed ? We answer no, from the following reasons :

1. Because Christ is nowhere called an angel in this book, nor can he be, because he is the *author* of it.

2. Because Christ is mentioned by his *proper name* in contra-distinction to the angel in the fourth verse, "For the witness of Jesus."

3. Because, wherever, according to the law of this book Christ or an angel from God are mentioned, they are always described and qualified in such a manner as to leave no doubt as to who are meant. This must necessarily be so, or the book could not be understood with any certainty. For instance, in chap. xix : 11-16, one is represented as riding upon a "white horse," "called faithful and true," "vesture dipped in blood," "his name is called the word of God." "And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written,

KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS." Here, although his name is not given, yet no one can doubt who is meant. Also, in regard to the angels and glorified saints, they are ALWAYS described as clothed in white raiment, (see chap. iii: 5; iv: 4; vii: 9, 13; xv: 6; xix: 8, 11,) or in some other glorious appearance, as in chap. i: 16; x: 1; xviii: 1, &c.; or else they are told in plain terms, so that no one need to make a mistake in these matters.

4. Because Christ does not, as we shall soon see, have the key of the bottomless pit. He has the *keys of death and hell*, but not of the bottomless pit. These terms are as different in the original as they are in the translation, and mean entirely different things. The first term is "hades," which ALWAYS means the "place of the dead." The second term is "abusson," which means abyss, or bottomless pit.

5. Because the angel "having the key of the bottomless pit," is shown in chapter ix: 1, 11, to be "THE angel of the bottomless pit," whose name is "Abaddon" or "Apollyon." This angel, to whom the key of the bottomless pit was given, according to the first verse of chapter ix., is also declared to be *the king of the bottomless pit*.

6. Because when Christ's coming is referred to, it is always spoken of in appropriate language, indicating the grandeur and sublimity of the event, as in chap. i: 7—"BEHOLD, HE COMETH WITH CLOUDS; AND EVERY EYE SHALL SEE HIM," &c.

From this it is seen how utterly short this angel is, who manifests no glory whatever, of representing the second coming of Christ in the "CLOUDS OF HEAVEN," in "the GLORY OF HIS FATHER WITH THE HOLY ANGELS;" "with POWER AND GREAT GLORY." If this angel had possessed any glory, John would have said so, for this is the rule which he follows throughout his Revelation. Let this fact be kept constantly in mind, and all will be clear as we proceed.

From all these facts it is proved that the angel represents neither Christ nor any other glorified being, but, on the contrary, represents a class of rulers belonging to the governments of this world. Further evidence will be given of this fact as we progress.

From this it will be seen that the "key" and the "great chain," are symbolic, and, by consequence, the bottomless pit must be also. Of this further proof will also be given soon. We would here remark, in order that we may not be misapprehended, that this exposition neither proves or dis-

proves the existence of a *literal* devil. If it proves anything on the point, however, it proves that such a being does really exist, or he would not here be introduced as a symbol, as we shall soon unmistakably prove him to be. Both in Daniel and Revelation, "beasts" that do really exist, such as lions, leopards, bears, rams, goats, &c., are used as symbols of governments. So that no one will understand us as trying to disprove the existence of the literal devil, by showing that the dragon here is used symbolically. We have already shown, by the most indisputable evidence, in the preceding chapter, that the "abusson" or "bottomless pit," was a symbol, and as such, really symbolized the Catholic church. The fact, as universally admitted, that France is the "beast out of the bottomless pit," proves beyond question that it is a symbol, and as such symbolizes the Catholic church; for it was out of the Catholic church alone that France ascended when she made an open profession of infidelity or atheism, in 1791-2.

Also, in the 9th chapter, the bottomless pit is spoken of in connection with the sounding of the fifth trumpet, which is universally admitted to be as far back as the eighth century. There, too, it is spoken of in such a manner as to prove, beyond doubt, that it is a symbol. But we have so fully established this in the preceding chapter, that we need not dwell longer on this point.

Having proved that the angel was a symbol of a class of rulers, it must be very evident that the *chain* was a symbol of imperial law. Thus Justinian bound the dragon of the Greek empire in the Catholic church, by an imperial edict, or law, in 532; and he "set a seal upon him," by causing all the pagans to be baptized into the Catholic faith; and we shall soon see that the same thing took place, in the Roman empire in the west, which marks the beginning of the 1000 years.

Having proved that the angel, chain, key and bottomless pit, are symbols, the dragon must be also. Indeed, if one thing is symbolic, so must the others be. For how could the literal devil be bound with a symbolic chain, sealed with a symbolic seal, and be put into a symbolic pit. One thing is certain—that if the literal devil is meant, he has been bound in the bottomless pit, for the bottomless pit period ended in the French Revolution. That the dragon of the 12th and 20th chapters are the same, is abundantly proved by the *appellations*, which are precisely the same in both cases. And what puts it beyond question, is the fact that the dragon, in both chapters, is declared to be "THAT OLD SERPENT." Now there never has been but ONE OLD SERPENT, "which is called the

devil and satan," and that one is the one that tempted Eve in the garden. Consequently, when it is declared in both chapters, that the dragon spoken of is "THAT OLD SERPENT which is," or "which is called the devil and satan," it is positively proved that they both refer to, and mean the same thing, since there never has been, as we have before remarked, but ONE "old serpent," called the devil and satan. Further, in the 12th chapter it is said that the dragon is THAT OLD SERPENT "which deceiveth the whole world," and in chapter 20, it is said that he, that is, *that* old serpent, was cast into the "bottomless pit," "that he should deceive the nations no more till the thousand years should be fulfilled."

Having settled the question that the dragon in both chapters, (the 12th and 20th) are precisely the same power, we shall next settle the fact that the dragon is a symbol of the *heathen* Roman empire. Will those who hold that the dragon is the LITERAL devil, in these chapters, please tell us how either the true or the apostate church was fed and nourished in the wilderness, just 1260 years, from the *literal face* of the literal devil? Please tell us when, in the history of the past, the *face* of the literal devil disappeared from either church just 1260 years or any other time? We boldly say to all such that *you know* that no such thing has ever taken place, and yet the word of God declares that the "woman" in the "wilderness," which we have proved to be the Catholic church, should be nourished from the "face" of the "serpent," that is, from the face of that old serpent, the devil and satan, a thousand two hundred and three-score days. This proves that THAT OLD SERPENT which tempted our first parents in the garden of Eden, is referred to, upon the principle of all the symbols in the book nearly, as a symbol of the Western Pagan Roman empire. Nearly all the symbols in the book are taken from former times and circumstances. The following note, from Dr. Clarke, also very clearly shows the extreme absurdity of making the dragon in this book mean the literal devil. He says:

"Now, if by the 'dragon' be meant the 'devil,' then we are necessarily led to this conclusion, that the great apostate spirit is a monster having seven heads and ten horns; and also that he has a tail, with which he drags after him the third part of the stars of Heaven. The appellations, 'old serpent,' 'devil' and 'satan,' must, therefore, be understood figuratively. The heathen power is called 'that old serpent which deceiveth the whole world,' from its subtlety against the Christians, and its causing the whole Roman world, as far

as it was in its power, to embrace the absurdities of paganism. It is called the 'devil,' from its continual false accusations and slanders against the true worshippers of God, for the devil is a liar from the beginning; and it is also called 'satan,' from a Hebrew word signifying an adversary, from its frequent persecutions of the Christian church.'"

Again, we are told that the dragon—that old serpent—the devil and satan, cast out of his mouth waters, as a flood, after the woman, to cause her to be carried away of the flood. Now, when did the literal devil cast out of his mouth a literal flood of waters, to drown the whole church, whether true or false?

For the time when this was fulfilled, see pp. 26, 27 of this book.

All these facts go to show that the *dragon* of Revelation is a symbol of a *heathen power*; and it was in this sense alone that the woman was fed and nourished from his face 1260 years; and she was thus nourished from his face, because he was in the bottomless pit, or covered up under a false profession of Christianity.

The bottomless pit is, in addition to what we have proved before, a symbol, because it contained living nations, like France, which ascended out of it, in the French revolution. Thus we have now proved, 1, that the angel "having the key of the bottomless pit and a great chain in his hand," was Abaddon or Apollyon—the "destroyer," the king of the bottomless pit; 2, that the bottomless pit is a symbol of the false doctrines of the Catholic faith and worship; 3, that the dragon is a symbol of the heathen Roman empire; 4, that the dragon was cast into the bottomless pit, in the Greek empire, in 532, and ascended out of it again no later than 1792. All these are facts, which cannot be denied.

Having proved that the dragon has already been in the bottomless pit, it follows, as a certainty, that the 20th chapter, in this respect, has been fulfilled. But before we proceed to show when it was fulfilled, and also to consider the thousand years' reign of the saints with Christ, we wish to look at another point, for a short time, which is as follows: After John saw the dragon cast into the bottomless pit, he says, "I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them." The question now arises, what thrones are these? The thrones of the twelve apostles, says one. But are you quite sure of it? That such a position is not correct, that the thrones of the twelve apostles, if they are to have such in the kingdom, are NOT referred to, is proved positively from the fact that, if John saw the thrones of the apostles in the king-

dom of God, he would most certainly have said, I saw **WHITE** thrones; and they that sat upon them were arrayed in white, &c. This is the **INVARIABLE** rule throughout the book. Hence in verse 11 he says: "I saw a **GREAT WHITE THRONE**." The adjective **WHITE** is here used to distinguish this throne from any of the thrones of earth; and besides, if anything presents any unusual appearance, John is always particular to speak of it; and were it not for this fact, no one could understand the Revelation. Hence, in the 19th chapter, we have "**WHITE** horses;" "fine linen, **WHITE** and clean." The horses here being **WHITE** distinguish them from the horses of this world, which, according to the meaning of the symbols, cannot be said to be white. So that if anything which John saw is **WHITE**, or has any glory attending it, John never fails to tell us of it; otherwise the prophecy would be deficient, and he would fail of his mission as a true prophet. What he saw he was commanded or required to **WRITE**. From this we are assured that the thrones which John saw were **NOT** white, and therefore were not the thrones of the immortal apostles in the kingdom of God, but, on the contrary, were the thrones of the "seven kings," as brought to view in the 17th chapter, those kings which succeeded the dragon or Heathen Roman empire in the west.

"And judgment was given unto them;" that is, to those who sat on the thrones. The word translated judgment in the original is "*krima*," which signifies "decision, decree, judgment," which implies rule or authority. The dragon previously had had the decision or rule, but now that he is cast into the bottomless pit, the decision or rule passes into the hands of the *seven kings* of the leopard beast, who exercises the rule or decision, in connection with the angel or king of the bottomless pit, during the time that the dragon is in the bottomless pit; for the dragon will only stay in the pit while there is a power sufficiently strong enough to keep him there.

The angel of the bottomless pit must represent the bishops and clergy of the Catholic church, as the angels of the seven churches represented the ministers of those churches, whether they were many or few. It will be seen in the fulfillment, that the Catholic priests accompanied the soldiers, so that as fast as the pagans were subdued by the power of the sword, they were "laid hold" of by the Catholic priests and baptized into the Catholic church; and they were held there by the penalty of an imperial law, which was evidently represented by the great chain; the seal evidently representing *baptism*.

This was the case in the Greek empire, in 532; for Gibbon

informs us that the *priests* accompanied the *soldiers* in carrying into effect the edict of Justinian.

Having proved that the "thrones" in the 4th verse, which succeeded the dragon, were the thrones of the seven kings, in the 17th chapter, we have, therefore, forever overturned the theory of this thousand years being after the second advent of Christ.

The fact that the bottomless pit is a symbol, is another positive evidence against this view, and especially so, since the bottomless pit period ended with, as we have proved, the French Revolution.

We have also proved the dragon to be a symbol of the heathen Roman empire. It is a matter of certainty that if one of these things is a symbol, all must be, as a literal devil could not be bound in a symbolic bottomless pit, nor by a symbolic chain, &c.

We shall now proceed to show when it was done, or when the dragon was finally cast into the bottomless pit, in the Roman empire in the west; after which we shall notice the 1000 years' reign of the saints with Christ.

We have seen, in the second chapter of this book, that the western Roman empire was divided into ten kingdoms; and we have also shown that three of those ten kingdoms were plucked up by the Greek empire. We shall now proceed to show that the last of these divisions, which held the pagan superstitions—the Saxons—were finally compelled to be baptized into the Catholic faith, and renounce paganism, about 792. To give the reader a clear idea of all the facts and circumstances in the case, we shall commence the history with the year 779. The following is from Michelet's History of France, vol. 1, pp. 117–118:

Resting on the Elbe, the boundary between the Saxons and the Slaves, he [Charlemagne] busied himself in settling the country which he fancied he had conquered. Again receiving the oaths of the Saxons, at Ohrheim, he had them baptized by thousands, and charged the abbot of Fulda to establish a regular system of conversion, of religious conquest. An army of priests succeeded his army of soldiers. The whole land, says the Chronicles, was partitioned out between the abbots and the bishops. Eight large and powerful bishoprics were created in succession [Minden, Halderstadt, Verden, Bremen, Munster, Hildesheim, Osnaburgh, and Paderborn,] foundations at once ecclesiastical and military, where the most docile of the chiefs will take the title of counts to execute against their brothers the orders of the bishops. Tribunals

instituted throughout the country will pursue backsliders, and severely teach them the gravity of the vows so often taken and violated. * * * While the priests reign, convert and judge, and securely pursue their murderous education of the barbarians, Witikind (A. D. 782) again swoops down from the north to destroy their work. The Saxons crowd around him, defeat Charlemagne's lieutenants near Sonnetal, (the Valley of the Sun,) and, when the slow moving masses of the Frankish army come up, disperse as quickly as they had drawn together. Four thousand five hundred remained, who probably having their families to provide for, could not follow Witikind in his rapid retreat. The king of the Franks burnt and destroyed all before him until they were given up; and his counsellors, being churchmen, imbued with the notions derived from the Roman form of administration, and constituting a government at once of priests and jurists, coldly cruel, and uninformed by any touch of generosity or knowledge of the barbarian character—saw in these captive Saxons so many criminals guilty of high treason, and judged them by the letter of the law. They were all beheaded in one day at Verden. Their countrymen, who endeavored to avenge them, were themselves defeated and massacred at Dethmold and near Osnaburgh. The conquerors, whose operations were often suspended in the humid region by rains, inundations, and the impossibility of forcing a way from the depth of the mud, determined to prosecute the war through the winter; and the forests stripped of their leaves, and the marshes frozen over, no longer screened the fugitives—each isolated in his hut, with his wife and children, falls the prey of the soldiery, like the deer crouching in its lair over the tender hind.

“Saxony remained undisturbed for eight years—Witikind having surrendered.”

Thus, it is seen, that as early as 782, the pagan Saxons were compelled to be baptized into the Catholic church, as were the pagans in the Greek empire in 532. “An army of priests,” says the historian, “succeeded the army of soldiers.” Thus it is seen how the angel of the bottomless pit, representing the Catholic bishops and clergy, “laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent,” in the pagans of those times, and bound and cast him into the bottomless pit. But we find the dragon was not fully subdued yet. “The Saxons remaining undisturbed for eight years,” says the historian.

Hence, in the year 791, they revolted again, and returned “to the worship of their old gods,” but Charlemagne, in 792,

attacked them for the last time, which resulted in their final subjugation, as the following history will show; for it will be seen that the Saxons were entirely subjugated by the war and banishment into strange lands. Michelet, vol. 1, p. 119 :

"Charlemagne's armies were recruited in Frisia and in Saxony, quite as much as in Austrasia, and it was these nations which really suffered by the losses sustained by the Franks. They had not only to bear the yoke of the clergy, but what was intolerable to these barbarians, were forced to forsake the dress, manners, and language of their fathers, to bury themselves in the battalions of the Franks, their enemies, and to conquer and die for them. And they seldom saw their country again, being sent three or four hundred leagues off against the Spanish Moors, or the Lombards of Beneventum. Death being their fate, the Saxons preferred facing it in their own land. They massacred Charlemagne's lieutenants, burnt the churches, expelled or murdered the priests, and returned enthusiastically to the worship of THEIR OLD GODS. They made common cause with the Avars, instead of furnishing an army against them. * * * He [Charlemagne] determined to unpeople Saxony, since he could not subdue it. Encamping on the Weser, and perhaps, by way of convincing the Saxons that he would not relax his hold on them, calling his camp Heerstall, after the name of the patrimonial castle of the Carolingians on the Meuse, he thence carried his inroads on every side, and forced, from more than one canton, as many as a third of the inhabitants to be delivered up to him. These flocks of fugitives were then driven southward and westward, and settled in strange lands, in the midst of Christian and hostile populations, and speaking a different tongue. In like manner, the Babylonian and Persian monarchs had transported the Jews to the Tigris, and the people of Chalcis to the shores of the Persian Gulf; and so had Probus transported colonies of Franks and Frisons as far as the shores of the Euxine sea.

* * * * *

"Now, at last, Charlemagne began to hope that he should enjoy some rest. To judge by the extent of his dominion, if not by his real strength, he must have been the most powerful monarch at this time on the face of the globe."

We have thus proved that the Saxons—the last remains of the dragon or serpent power in the Roman empire of the west, were now, excepting those banished, baptized into the Catholic church, and bound there by the great chain of imperial law. "And set a seal upon him that he should deceive the nations

ADVENTIST
HERITAGE CENTER

no more:" that is, they should no longer be permitted to teach paganism, or infidelity.

It will be seen, from the foregoing history, that the pagans were in open war with the Catholic church, until they were compelled by the power of the sword, to be baptized into her faith and worship. Thus the dragon was as effectually cast into the bottomless pit, in the Roman empire in the west, in 792, as he was in the Greek empire in the east, in 532, and precisely by the same means. In both cases, the priests accompanied the soldiers, so that as fast as they were subdued by the one, they were laid hold of by the other, and cast into the bottomless pit by baptism, for that was the door and seal of the church.

From this, it will be seen that, as the woman was "fed" and "nourished from the face of the serpent," from 532, in the Greek empire, so she was "fed" and "nourished from the face of the serpent," by the Roman empire, from 792. The Greek empire was, as we have shown, the first head of the beast, and the Roman empire in the west, was the second head; so that, in the two empires we have the two starting points for the two periods, and both end in the French Revolution. With the casting of the dragon into the bottomless pit, in 792, was the final subversion of that power, so that he could, in neither empire, "deceive the nations no more," by teaching pagan doctrines, or paganism. If the nations were "deceived" after that, it was not by the dragon or pagans, but by the woman, or Catholic church. The dragon teachings are open infidelity; but after he was baptized into the Catholic church, he was compelled to profess faith in Christ, according to the doctrines of the Catholic church, so that, in no sense, can it be said that the dragon deceived the nations, after 792, at any time prior to the French Revolution, in 1791-2. Then, indeed, as we have proven in the previous chapter, the dragon ascended out of the bottomless pit in Infidel France. That power made an open profession of infidelity, and, like the dragon, a thousand years before, began immediately to make war on the word of God, religion, and especially on the Catholic church, which, in 1792, was totally destroyed throughout the dragon empire—France.

We have now proved that the dragon has been in the bottomless pit a thousand years, by facts in history, that are beyond dispute. He was cast into it in the Greek empire, in 532, and by that power, the "woman" was fed and nourished from his face from that time; but he still, by virtue of existing in the Roman empire in the west, was deceiving the na-

tions, more or less, up to 792. So that the 1000 years began when the dragon was so fully cast into the bottomless pit, both in the east and west, that it can be said that he "deceived the nations no more." It contemplates the entire subjugation of the dragon, throughout both empires to the Catholic faith and worship.

Reader, has this been done? It has, you know it has; therefore the word of God has been fulfilled in this respect. The thousand years ended in 1792, so that we have, in the 1000 years, an additional evidence, of the most positive character, that the 1260 years ended in that year, at the latest, because the dragon was then out of the bottomless pit, in the fullest sense of the term, and overturned and destroyed the Catholic church, throughout France, as we have abundantly proved in the previous chapter.

Having thus shown that the one thousand years are in the past, and ended in the French Revolution, we now come to the exposition of the one thousand years' reign of the saints with Christ. And here we would ask the reader, before judging of the correctness of our position, on this point, to first read ALL we have to say.

The difficulty in understanding the thousand years reign of the saints with Christ to be in the past, has arisen, evidently, from having overlooked the fact, as we shall prove it to be, that the saints have reigned with Christ ever since the commencement of the gospel dispensation; not that they have reigned in the sense that they will in the future kingdom, but in the sense required to fulfill our text under consideration, if it is to be regarded genuine, which very many, we would inform our readers, very much doubt.

The idea is not that the saints were to reign with Christ just a thousand years and no longer, but that they were to reign with him, as Professor Whiting and others render it, "*the*" or "*those*" thousand years; that is, notwithstanding the thousand years were to be the darkest and the most perilous period in the history of the world to the Church of Christ still the saints were to live and reign with him during that period.

The first point to settle is, has Christ been the supreme ruler of the world ever since his resurrection and ascension to the "right hand of God. We answer, he has. First, Jesus said, after his resurrection, as recorded in Matthew xxviii: 18: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." "Go ye, therefore, and teach," that is, give my laws "to all nations," &c., "teaching them" (all nations), "to observe all

things whatsoever I have commanded you." Thus Christ became *supreme ruler in heaven and in earth*, after his resurrection, and because of this, he sent forth his laws to, and demanded obedience of, "all nations," under the penalty of death.

That Christ has *reigned* ever since, all power was given to him "in heaven and in earth," is a fact too palpable to be denied.

Says 1st Peter iii: 22: "Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him." Thus it is proved that to be or to sit on the right hand of God, is to be supreme ruler in heaven and in earth. Again: Eph. i: 20, 21: "Which he wrought in Christ, when he *raised him* from the *dead*, and set him at his *own right hand* in the heavenly places, far above *all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name* that is named, not only in *this world*, but also in *that which is to come*."

Thus Paul settles the question forever that Christ has been the supreme ruler "IN THIS WORLD" ever since he ascended to the throne of his Father. One more text of the many that might be adduced in proof of this point must suffice for the present—Rev. i: 5: "And from Jesus Christ, who IS the faithful witness, and the first begotten of the dead, and the Prince of the Kings of the earth." Here Christ is positively declared to have been, ever since his resurrection, the "PRINCE" ("King"—chapter xix: 16) "of the kings of the earth" which is in perfect harmony, as we have already seen, with Matthew xxviii: 18, where the Saviour declared, after his resurrection, that ALL power was given unto him in heaven and in earth. Thus it is proved that Christ is not only high priest under the gospel dispensation, but he is also King, or supreme ruler. It is a very great mistake, and one that has been followed with very evil consequences, to suppose that Christ has fulfilled, since his resurrection, but the one office of high priest. He reigns to-day, and because he reigns, there is mercy for poor fallen man. But the time is but a little in the future when he will deliver up the kingdom to God (1st Cor. xv: 24)—when God will take to himself again his great power (Rev. xi: 17) and will reign to the destruction of all his enemies, or (verse 18) "them which destroy the earth."

Having thus proved that Christ has reigned supreme ever since he ascended to the throne of God, it is a very easy matter to prove that the saints have reigned with him; for if Christ has reigned over the world, he has done so in connec-

tion with his saints. Hence says 1st Peter ii: 9, in speaking of the Gentile Christian Church: "But ye are a *chosen generation*, a ROYAL," that is, a KINGLY "PRIESTHOOD, an holy nation," &c. That Peter here refers to the Gentile Christian church, is put beyond question by the following (10th) verse thus:

"Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God: which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy."

Thus it is proved by Peter, that the members of the Church of Christ are not only priests with him, but they are also kings with him, and consequently reign with him. Hence says Revelation i: 6—"And HATH made us KINGS and PRIESTS unto God and his Father; not *will* but *hath*." Thus it is seen that Peter and Revelation perfectly agree in this matter, and both prove that the saints fulfill the two offices of kings and priests at one and the same time. This, of itself, upsets forever the idea, so prevalent in certain quarters, that Christ does not fulfill the two offices of "king" and "priest" at the same time. And further: in Hebrews vii: 17, we are informed that Christ was made a "priest after the order of Melchisedec;" and in the 1st and 2d verses of the same chapter we are informed that this Melchisedec was both *king* and *priest* at the same time, thus: "For this Melchisedec, *king* of Salem, and *priest* of the Most High God," * * * "being by interpretation *king* of righteousness, and after that also *king* of Salem, which is *king* of peace."

Thus it is proved, for Christ, in order to have been "made after the order of Melchisedec," must have been made a king and priest at the same time and must officiate as such.

Paul, in 1st Corinthians iv: 8, speaks of the Church as having "reigned as kings," and also of himself as reigning.

We have now, we trust, given sufficient evidence to satisfy the reader on this subject. We might give very much more, but this, we think, should be sufficient. What, then, is the idea, in the light of all these facts, in regard to the reign of Christ and the saints during the thousand years that the seven-headed and ten-horned dragonic power was shut up in the bottomless pit of Catholicism? It is unquestionably simply this, that notwithstanding the thousand years were a period of unprecedented darkness and of slaughter of the saints of Christ, still they lived, and living, as we have positively proved, they reigned, and therefore reigned with Christ.

Says Jesus: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the

end of the world." Hence, as the saints, as we have positively proved, are *kings* and *priests unto God*, in this present dispensation, and as Christ lives and reigns as the supreme ruler over the world, so they (the saints) live and reign with him; and, by consequence, they lived and reigned with him during the thousand years that the dragonic power, as we have already explained, was in the bottomless pit.

We have thus shown, we think, most conclusively that the thousand years of Revelation are in the past and ended in 1792.

Infidel France was the dragon revived in the eighth head, the seven heads of the dragon having existed previous to the commencement of the thousand years, as we have shown in the first chapter of this book. We will give one or two extracts here, which will not fail to satisfy the reader, we think, as to the dragonic character of France from as early as 1792.

France declared, among other things—

"That tutelary gods, even dead men, may be canonized, consecrated and worshipped.

"That Jesus Christ was an imposter.

"That human reason is the only true God. By an edict of the Constituent Assembly, there was a general sale of all ecclesiastical property; and every kind of property connected with churches or charities was confiscated. The magnificent church of St. Genevieve, at Paris, was changed by the National Assembly into a repository for the remains of their great men, or rather into a Pagan Temple, and, as such, was aptly distinguished by the name of the Pantheon.

"It was to this temple, or Pantheon, that the remains of Voltaire and Rousseau were conveyed in a most magnificent procession; a compliment which was afterward paid to the infamous Marat, whom Kett styles 'The Nero of the Revolution.' The bones of Voltaire were placed upon the altar, and incense was offered by the infatuated multitude in this reign of liberty."—Dr. Thomas Coke, LL. D., who wrote in 1807.

"On the memorable 26th of August, in the year 1792, an open profession of atheism and irreligion and infidelity was made, and forthwith acted upon, by a whole nation once devoted to the papal superstitions. Christianity was then formally abolished, as a notorious and malignant imposture by the government of revolutionary France; and so well did the people second them, that, while not a trace of the gospel could be found throughout the reprobate metropolis, every frantic oration in praise of atheism was loudly and enthusiastically applauded."—Faber on the Prophecies, vol. 3, p. 363.

Thus it is seen that France in 1792 was, in the highest sense of the term, a dragonic or pagan power, and therefore was the dragon out of the bottomless pit.

We have now proved, we trust, to the satisfaction of the reader, that the thousand years, under consideration, are in the past; and, by consequence, they ended no later than the fore part of 1792; for there is no other power that could possibly be represented by the dragon, in modern times, but France, since no other power has established infidelity, by law. Just as certain as we have arrived at the time of the end, just so certain it is that the 1260 and 1000 years ended as early as 1792.

The 5th verse—"But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished," &c.; we make no pretensions at explaining, since it is now quite generally given up as an interpolation. It is not found in a single Syriac manuscript extant, and is also wanting in a large number of the Greek copies. And it is further proved to be incorrect, from the fact that there is no resurrection brought to view at the beginning of the thousand years. The only resurrection in the chapter is in the 12th and 13th verses. There the resurrection is shown in connection with the appearance of the GREAT WHITE THRONE, and Him that sat on it, and the passing away of "the earth and the heaven." Here all classes are brought to judgment—the books are opened, and the Book of Life with the rest—thus showing, beyond question, that all classes—wicked and righteous—are judged at one and the same time. And this is further most conclusively proved by our Saviour in John v: 28: "For the HOUR is coming IN THE WHICH ALL," not a part, but "ALL that are in the graves shall hear his voice," &c. This proves that both classes—the wicked and the righteous—come forth to the resurrection IN the same HOUR, and not a thousand years apart. The same voice that reaches the ear of the one class, is also heard by the other.

This declaration of the Saviour should be sufficient of itself, to satisfy every one on this subject. In Daniel vii: 8-10, the "little horn" is shown to continue until "the judgment" is "set and the books" are "opened." The fact of the books being opened, shows that it is the same judgment spoken of by the Revelator in chapter xx: 11-13, which proves that the thousand years transpires before the little horn and the fourth beast of Daniel have finished their course. It is impossible, therefore, but that the thousand years are in the past,

since they must be fulfilled, as we have seen, prior to the coming of Christ and the sitting of the judgment.

Having now settled the point in regard to the resurrection, we will next examine two or three strong texts which are supposed to teach a definite thousand years reign of Christ, after his second advent. The first is found in Hebrews iv: 9:

“There remaineth, therefore, a *rest* to the people of God.”

This *rest* is supposed, and which we readily admit, to be the anti-type of the seventh day, on which God rested “from all his works.”

The first question to be settled is, what does “from all his works” here refer to? The answer is unmistakeable. It is “from all his works” in creating the world. Now, in order that the “rest” of God here, can be made typical of any definite period of time, whether it be one year or a thousand years, it is necessary to show that when the literal seventh day was ended, God commenced again the work of creation. But this cannot be shown. He has rested, from the beginning of the seventh day, “from all his works” referred to, up to the present time, and will continue to, no doubt, to all eternity. Thus the theory falls to the ground, at once; for the literal seventh day was only the beginning of an eternal rest “from all his works,” in creating the world.”

Again, who can believe, in the light of the word of God, that the “rest” that “remaineth” “to the people of God,” is to be only one thousand years long. If this is so, then at the end of the thousand years, the whole family of God must either die, or at once begin another six thousand years of *work*. This, perhaps, no one is prepared to believe; and yet it is true, if the seventh day is typical of a thousand years; for the “rest” that remains, on this principle, cannot possibly exceed the limits of the anti-typical day.

No further evidence, we think, is required to show the utter absurdity of the idea that the seventh day typifies a limited period of rest to the people of God.

But does not Peter say, that “one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.” We answer, he does. But this is simply saying that all time with the Lord, whether it be one day or a thousand years, is the same—is as nothing. Hence, says David, (Psalm xc: 4): “For a thousand years, in thy sight, are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night.” Therefore, as a day “when it is past,” is as nothing with the Lord, so is a thousand years in his sight; and this is, virtually, what Peter says, when he says that “one day is with the Lord as a thou-

sand years, and a thousand years, that is, with the Lord, is "as one day."

We have now proved, by the word of God, that the thousand years, under consideration, are in the past; and, by consequence, they ended no later than 1792; for there is no other power that could possibly be represented by the dragon, in modern times, but France, since no other power has established infidelity by law. Just as certain as we have arrived at the time of the end, just so certain it is that the 1260 and 1000 years ended as early as 1792.

We regard it as utterly impossible that we can be mistaken that France is the beast that ascended out of the bottomless pit, in the French revolution, for the history of that event cannot be doubted; and, therefore, we *know* that when France established infidelity, by law, and destroyed the Catholic church, within her limits, the word of God was fulfilled. We cannot conceive how any, who have had the facts brought before them, can doubt for a moment. Never was the word of God more clearly fulfilled.

Verse 7. "And when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison."

Verse 8. "And shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea."

Verse 9. "And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven, and devoured them."

In regard to the above the reader should constantly bear in mind that we are dealing with symbolic prophecy, and then there will be no difficulty in the way of understanding the above verses.

"And when the thousand years are expired," &c. In 1791-2 the power of the Great Harlot church was broken, and, consequently, the dragon in Infidel France was loosed, and, therefore, burst forth, out of his prison. French infidelity since that time, has spread rapidly throughout the world and has interwoven itself in various forms in all classes and societies of men—until there are but a very few, indeed, who give evidence of any *real faith* in the word of God. While there are many who profess faith in it, still there are but few who give evidence by their works, which is the true criterion to judge by, that they really believe it.

(9A)

The result is, that the nations have "went up," in the language of the prediction, or, in other words, have *risen* "up on the breadth of the whole earth" in opposition to the plain literal word of God, and have thus "compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city." The "beloved city" here is, and can be nothing more, or less, than the "Holy City" of chapter xi, which was trodden under foot by the "beast like a leopard," for forty-two months or 1260 years. Thus we learn that the "beast like a leopard" was to tread the Holy City under foot during a certain period of time, after which the dragon was to "compass it about." Of course the same principle of interpretation must obtain in both cases; so that upon the same principle the first beast trod the Holy City under foot, the second beast has compassed it about. The Holy City during the 1260 years, or during the period of its being trodden under foot, was all over the earth. So it is, and was to be when it should be compassed about. And it is a fact which cannot be successfully denied, that the influence and power of the Church of Christ is as effectually cut off and destroyed to-day, by the great spirit of infidelity which has been spreading so rapidly throughout the world since the French Infidel Revolution, as it was during the 1260 years of the rule of the Catholic beast.

The word of God has lost its influence and power in the world, and therefore the true Church is most completely hemmed in or "compassed about" by this great spirit of infidelity peculiar to these days.

This spirit of infidelity has also infused the revolutionary spirit into all nations, so that there is not a nation under heaven that is not now ripe for, or on the very eve of, a grand conflagration. This is a fact too generally admitted to require proof from us here. Thus the dragon out of the bottomless pit has gathered the "nations," "Gog and Magog," to "the battle of that great day of God Almighty." In the language of prophecy the "nations are angry"—each nation is full of angry commotion within its own borders; infidelity is working disunion in every direction, so that a grand political "earthquake" is about to burst forth, "such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake and so great."

O, sinner and backslider, will you not flee to Christ at once. The "*little season*," during which the dragon was to be loosed to go out to deceive the nations and gather them to the battle of the great day of God Almighty, we have seen is seventy-five years, which is the balance of the 1335 years, after deducting the 1260. This seventy-five years beginning

in the fore part of 1792, when the dragon was loosed, or ascended out of the bottomless pit, must end in the fore part of 1867.

Thus, dear reader, we have proved that the thousand years are in the past and that the battle of the great day of God Almighty will, in a few months, burst upon this world in all its overwhelming and destructive influence. Dear reader, we exhort you, if you have not already done so, to fly to Christ at once. O, delay not, now that probationary time is so short. Now is your only time. Will you not improve it, that you may be saved from the universal destruction that is about to sweep over the earth. God grant you grace to do so. Amen.

CHAPTER X.

THE DARKENING OF THE SUN.

Matt. 24: 20. "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened," &c.

This declaration of our Saviour, it is supposed by some, proves that the 1260 days, or years, of Revelation, must have ended at the darkening of the sun in 1780. This view of the case, however, is, beyond all question, a mistake, for the following reasons:

1st. If the 1260 years ended in 1780, then the 1335 years must have ended in 1854. But what took place in that year to justify such a conclusion? Most certainly nothing, unless the blessing promised at the end of the days was to be fulfilled in sick hearts in consequence of deferred hope. And then, again: we think there is nothing more clearly revealed in the Scriptures, than that those days reach to the coming of Christ and the resurrection.

This fact is sufficiently proved from the consideration that the 1335 days are, beyond all possible mistake, the answer to the question, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" Therefore, as the question reaches to the end of the wonders, which is the resurrection, as will be seen by reading the first two verses of Dan. 12, the answer must reach to the same point. To take any other position, is simply to accuse the angels of God with duplicity, or using deception, which we think very few are prepared to do.

This proves that the 1260 days could not have ended at the darkening of the sun in 1780, and that, therefore, our Saviour's declaration has been by some misunderstood. For ourselves, we are satisfied that He had no reference to the 1260 years whatever, as He, not having received the Revelation at that time, could not have known anything about them; for if He understood the 1260 years at the time He made the declaration, then they were no Revelation to Him, at a subsequent period, after He ascended to heaven; for what He already knew could not, subsequently, have been a matter of revela-

tion to him. But we are assured, in the Book of Revelation, that He received the Revelation of the 1260 days, or years, after He ascended to heaven, and, by consequence, after He made the foregoing declaration.

We conclude, therefore, from these facts, that our Saviour, simply referred to the tribulation, without reference to its definite length or termination; and taking into consideration its great length, and the gradual manner in which it terminated, if the darkening of the sun took place within ten or twelve years of its extreme termination, it was quite sufficient to justify our Saviour's declaration. It is certain that there was but very little persecution on the church after A. D. 1780. Indeed, the "great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world," according to the declaration of our Saviour, was then ended; yet, as the law of persecution still existed in France up to the beginning of 1792, therefore the 1260 years could not have ended at an earlier date.

It is certain that the 1260 years, according to Revelation, was to cover the whole length of the war with the saints by the beast like a leopard, which war did not end fully until, as we have already remarked, toleration of religious worship was fully established in the beginning of 1792; and yet the "great tribulation, such as never was since the beginning of the world," &c., certainly ended by 1780; for although there was tribulation after that point, yet it could not be called "*great tribulation*."

This is the way we understand the matter. But if it should still be thought by some of our readers, that our Saviour had reference to the 1260 years, then we reply that Mark says: "*But in those days, after that tribulation;*" thus showing that, while the darkening of the sun was to take place after the "*great tribulation*," it was, at the same time, to occur within, or before the days ended. For, if the 1260 years are meant in Matthew, they are also meant in Mark, for they both have recorded the same discourse—the only point of difference between the two being, that the latter recorded more fully the statements of our Saviour than the former.

From these facts and considerations, then, it is proved that if our Saviour, in speaking of the "*great tribulation*," had reference to the 1260 years, then the sun was to be darkened in or a short time before they ended.

Thus we see nothing in the darkening of the sun, opposed to the ending of the 1260 days, or years, in 1792.

In taking a retrospective view of the Advent movement, from its commencement in 1843-4 to the present time, we have presented to our minds a most striking history of "hope deferred" that "maketh the heart sick." We see a people severing religious and social ties, leaving their occupations, despising the scoffs of the world, and "going forth to meet the Bridegroom." Confident of realizing their expectations, they walked out upon the prophetic word, without a doubt of the truthfulness of their position. The time passed; and though they were mistaken in their conclusions, their position was nominally a *correct* one when viewed in the light of Scripture, as they could not have fulfilled the word of God had they not been disappointed. And as the cloud that "came between the camp of the Egyptians, and the camp of Israel," was a "cloud of darkness" to the Egyptians, but at the same time "gave light by night" to the Israelites, so our past disappointments are a "cloud of darkness" and a "stumbling block" to the *world*, while they are glorious beacon lights to us; and thus it is that while "darkness covers the earth and gross darkness the people," "we have light in our dwelling." The world and the professed church look upon the Advent movement as a delusion, and, of course, occupying this position, they will probably stumble over our past mistakes until the Lord appears, for the reason that they fail to recognize one or two important facts in Scripture, namely: "The four watches," and the fact that the Saviour uses those watches to illustrate the movements of the church just prior to His advent. Those who were engaged in the movement of 1843-4 understood, from the "sure word of prophecy," that this sin-cursed earth after "groaning and travailing in pain" through its allotted period, had finally arrived at its night of destruction; that its sun was about to set in oblivion, its evening shades were gathering around, and that the light of God's eternal day was about to dawn upon them. They were correct in their first conclusion; the evening had come. But they overlooked one important fact in nature, viz: that between the shades of evening, and the day following, lies the long dark hours of night—"The four watches." Barnes, in his "Notes" on Matt. 14: 25, says: "In the time of our Saviour they divided the night into four watches. These watches consisted of three hours each. The first commenced at six and continued till nine; the second from nine to twelve; the third from twelve to three, and the fourth from three to six. The first was called evening, the second midnight, the third cock-crow-

ing, the fourth morning."—Mark 13: 35. It will be readily seen that there could not have been FOUR watches without a period of time to mark the beginning and ending of each watch, otherwise there would have been but one watch continuing through the whole night. But this was not the case: and as there were *but* four watches, we will endeavor to show, from the words of our Saviour, that there was to be but four watches for His advent, and that He would come in the last or morning watch. Now the church would not have kept the three past watches, had they understood this previous to 1843-4; and as Daniel's vision was "closed up and sealed till the time of the end," so likewise the fact, that they were to be disappointed three times, was hid from their eyes, in order to fulfill the word of God. The words of Christ in Mark 13: 35-37, prove this position: "For the Son of Man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house, and gave authority to His servants, and to every man his work, and commanded the porter to watch. "Watch ye, therefore," for ye know not when the master of the house cometh, at even, or at midnight, or at the cock-crowing, or in the morning: Lest coming suddenly He find you sleeping: and what I say unto you, I say unto all, Watch." That the Saviour meant to convey the idea that He would come in one of these watches, is evident from the language, for otherwise He would not have been definite, as to the number of the watches in connection with His coming. And from the fact that they did not know in what watch He would come, they were commanded to keep them *all*, "Lest coming suddenly," He should find them "sleeping." Proof, Luke 12: 37, &c.: "Blessed are those servants whom the Lord when He cometh shall find watching. And if He shall come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants." Now, the Saviour does not say that He *will* come in the "second" or "third watch," for if he had, He would not have mentioned a fourth, or "morning" watch, as there would have been no necessity for more than three. But He pronounced a blessing on those who should be found watching in the second or third watches. The first is not mentioned, but a *second* pre-supposes a first; and it is impossible to have more than one watch, without definite time. The first and second watches are brought to view in the parable of the "Ten Virgins—" Matthew 25: "Then shall the kingdom of heaven be likened unto ten virgins, which took their lamps and went forth to meet the bridegroom." And "while the bridegroom tarried, they all slumbered and slept. And at midnight ("second

watch'') there was a cry made, Behold the bridegroom cometh; go ye out to meet him."

The movement of 1843-4 was indeed a mighty going forth; its numbers were tens of thousands, and it was designed to be the greatest movement of the four; and it was perfectly natural that it should be; for the natural tendency of disappointment is to discourage, especially where there is a want of faith and a correct understanding of the word of God. Now, had they known that the bridegroom would *tarry*, they would not have gone forth at that time; nor could it have been said that the "bridegroom tarried," had there been no set time; for it is impossible to have a *tarry* without definite time. But "while the bridegroom tarried they all slumbered and slept." What did they go to sleep on? *TIME*. After the time passed they were without chart or compass as to their whereabouts, and consequently went to sleep; and had the Saviour come "suddenly," He would have found them in the very condition which He warned them against—"sleeping." But this was God's method of enlightening their minds upon the "time of their visitation."

They were then sent to school, as it were, to study the prophecies, which they did; light broke in upon the *tarrying* time, but not upon the watches, else the second watch would not have been kept in 1854. Daniel says: "In the time of the end," "many shall run to and fro, and *knowledge* shall be *INCREASED*," which could not have been fulfilled otherwise than by a gradual increase of knowledge. And what was this knowledge upon? certainly upon the subject the angel was speaking upon, which was the "time, times and an half," which Daniel could not understand. But the angel declares, that "the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand," (in the time of the end). And the Saviour says, "whoso readeth (Daniel) let him understand." They that were to understand, are called wise, *before* they understood. Who are the wise? "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."

It appears from "the word" that these watches were to decrease in interest, and numbers, as, one by one, they passed without bringing the desired event; for the Saviour says, "nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall He find faith on the earth," (Luke 18: 8); and this faith is in His coming. Continued disappointment has wearied the majority; they lacked the "oil" of faith "in their vessels with their lamps;" they did not "hold the beginning of" their "confidence steadfast unto the end." Thus we see that when we

came to the "third" or cock-crowing watch in 1859, very few engaged in it, compared to the two previous ones. Some had gone to sleep in the "tarry," and had not yet woke up. Paul says: "they that sleep, sleep in the night;" and those that go to sleep in the "evening watch," are not likely to wake up during the midnight, or cock-crowing watches, as their sleep becomes sounder as they advance into the night, and therefore will not wake up until the morning, at least, if *then*.

Of what does the Advent body chiefly consist to-day? Of those who acknowledge that the past disappointments were the providential means used to try their faith, and awaken an increased interest in the study of the prophecies, and thereby finally to bring out "the true light." "The path of the just is as the shining light, which shineth more and more unto the perfect day"—Prov. 4: 18. How do we acquire a knowledge of arithmetic? We have first to learn the name and value of the different numerals. Then we can begin to add, subtract, divide, &c.; but it is a gradual process, and we almost invariably fail to get correct answers to our first sums. But supposing we should give up in despair because we had made mistakes in our first calculations, should we *ever* become proficient in arithmetic? We think all will answer in the negative. The illustration is simple, yet to the point. It would be as equally absurd to answer our question in the *affirmative* as it is to present past disappointments as an evidence of future mistakes with regard to the prophetic periods.

Every disappointment has caused fresh investigation; and each investigation has thrown new light on our pathway, until, in our humble opinion, "the true light now shineth," and will increase in brilliancy unto "the perfect day." We have passed three watches, and there remaineth but *one more* to be kept. The gray dawn of the "morning watch" has appeared upon the horizon, and soon "shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings;" "And that knowing the time that now it is high time to awake out of sleep; for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent; the day is at hand; let us, therefore, cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light"—Rom. 13: 11-12. Let us "stand, therefore, with our loins girt about with truth," and we, ourselves, like unto men that wait for their Lord." Let us endeavor to wake up the slumbering virgins with the cry of "the morning cometh;" "let us not sleep as do others, but let us watch and be sober."—1st Thess. 5: 6. "The end of all things is at hand."—1st Pet. 4: 7.

(10)

CHAPTER XI.

THE TWENTY-THREE HUNDRED DAYS — Dan. viii: 13, 14.

The subject of the 2300 days is, unquestionably, one of great importance; and, from the different views taken of it heretofore, and which still obtain to some extent, at least, it therefore becomes necessary that we should give it more than an ordinary investigation; and this we purpose, by the assistance of divine grace, to do. It is our intention to make every point in the argument, so clear as to leave no doubts in the minds of the readers as to the truth of our position, and we therefore earnestly request their especial attention and examination of the subject, step by step, as we proceed.

The first point which we think necessary to examine is, at what event do the 2300 days terminate?—at the second coming of Christ, or, at some other event? for, unless this point is clearly settled, all further investigations will be useless. To settle this point we will first notice the question, in the 13th verse, which reads as follows: "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" The answer is found in the following verse: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

From the question and answer, it is shown that the *sanctuary* and the *host* were *both* to be trodden under foot the same length of time—to the end of the 2300 days; for the 2300 days is the answer to the question, "How long?" &c.

Now, as the host was to be trodden under foot the same length of time that the sanctuary was, and as the host cannot be trodden under foot after the coming of Christ and the resurrection, it is proved, therefore, that the 2300 days cannot extend beyond that event. Further evidence is found in proof of this position, should it be required by any of our readers, in the fact that the power that was to tread under foot the sanctuary and the host, comes to 'his end and none to help him,' according to chapter xi: 45, and xii: 1, at the standing up of Michael. Therefore, as the sanctuary and the

host were to be trodden under foot, by a certain power, to the end of the 2300 days, and as that power comes to his end, at the standing up of Michael and the resurrection, it is certain that neither the sanctuary or host can be trodden under foot by that power after that time; for they cannot be trodden under foot by a power, after that power ceases to exist. And, as that power comes to his end, at the coming of Christ and the resurrection, therefore the treading under foot and the 2300 days must terminate at the same point.

"Then shall the sanctuary be cleansed." This shows that the sanctuary will be cleansed, at the end of the 2300 days, and not seven years before, as some have supposed. The sanctuary cannot be cleansed while it is being trodden under foot; and, as it is to be trodden under foot to the end of the 2300 days, therefore it will be seen that it cannot be cleansed until those days are ended; and thus it is most clearly declared, by the angel, when he says: "Unto two thousand and three hundred days; THEN shall the sanctuary be cleansed."

The facts in the case, then, may be stated in a few words, thus—the little horn of chapter viii: 9-12, is shown to be the treading-under-foot power, and is to tread under foot the sanctuary and the host, from a given point (which we shall soon show) to the end of the 2300 days, when he comes to his end, at which time Michael stands up—the resurrection takes place, and the sanctuary is, or begins, to be cleansed. The idea that the "little horn," or Roman power, is to tread under foot the sanctuary and the host, or, the sanctuary alone, several years after Christ comes, is not only unscriptural, but extremely absurd. And yet this is the truth if the 2300 days reach seven years beyond that event.

But, since the treading-under-foot power, comes to his end at the standing up of Michael, the 2300 days must, therefore, end there also. Having thus shown that the 2300 days terminate at the coming of Christ, we shall next inquire what event marks their beginning.

And here we would remark, before going further, that there are three positions differing quite widely from each other. The first is, the beginning of the "pushing" of the "ram," or the Medo-Persian power, as brought to view in the 4th verse. The second is, the "going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem;" and the third, and last, is the full and complete restoration of the "daily sacrifice."

In order to make the subject clear to the mind of the reader, so as to leave no doubts in regard to which of the three positions is correct, we shall examine each one separately.

That the first position cannot be correct, will readily appear from the fact that the 2300 days, beginning at the "pushing" of the "ram," must have ended, as we shall positively prove, over half a century ago. To ascertain when Daniel saw the "ram," or the Medo-Persian power, (as it is explained to be in the 20th verse,) "pushing," it will only be necessary to inquire when that power "became great;" for, says Daniel, "I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beast could stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand; but he did according to his will, and 'BECAME GREAT.'" Here, it will be seen, that the "pushing" of the "ram" preceded his becoming *great*, and that he "became *great*" by "pushing." No one can fail, we think, to see this simple fact—that the ram began pushing before he became great, and continued to push until that end was accomplished. No other means is revealed in the prophecy, of his becoming great, but by pushing. Having settled this point, that the pushing of the ram preceded his becoming great, we have now only to ascertain when he became great, to know when Daniel saw him "pushing." This will be settled by the testimony of Cyrus, king of the ram or Medo-Persian power, as found in Ezra i: 2, which reads as follows: "Thus saith Cyrus, king of Persia, the Lord God of Heaven hath given me ALL THE KINGDOMS OF THE EARTH." This was in the first year of Cyrus, immediately after the overthrow of Babylon.

Now, as Cyrus declared that the "Lord God of Heaven" had given him "*all* the kingdoms of the earth" at that time, it is certain that the Medo-Persian power was as great then as it ever could be, because, having all the kingdoms of the earth in his possession, he could get nothing more.

The kingdom of Babylon was a universal kingdom, as Daniel declared to Nebuchadnezzar—that "thou, O, king, art a king of kings;" * * * "and wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of heaven, hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all;" therefore, when the Medes and Persians overthrew the kingdom of Babylon, and thus came to the "dominion" of that kingdom, they came to the dominion of the world; and hence Cyrus declared, as we have already seen, that the Lord God of Heaven had given him all the kingdoms of the earth.

Here, then, is where the "ram" became great; and, therefore, when Daniel saw him pushing, it was before the overthrow of the kingdom of Babylon. These are facts so clearly proved,

by the Bible, as to preclude the possibility of a mistake; for the "ram" was either great on succeeding to the dominion of Babylon, and "all the kingdoms of the earth," or he never was.

But it may be objected that his *becoming great*, had reference to his becoming great in "acts of kindness toward the Jews." But in what sense, we ask, could the Medo-Persian power become great in this respect, that it did not in the first year of Cyrus? Did he not grant *all* of them the privilege of going back to their own land and city to build their temple again? and did he not furnish them with all the means necessary to do so? Answer—He did. Thus it is shown that the Medo-Persian power became great in the first year of Cyrus in *every sense*—in acts of kindness towards the Jews, as well as in point of "dominion." Therefore, it is proved that the time when Daniel saw the "ram pushing," was before the first year of Cyrus, or, before the overthrow of the kingdom of Babylon.

Having thus shown that Daniel saw the "ram pushing," prior to his becoming great, and therefore prior to the overthrow of the kingdom of Babylon, we have also shown that if the 2300 days measure the whole vision, beginning with the "pushing" of the "ram," they must have terminated, as we have before stated, over half a century ago. But we have shown that those days must terminate at the second advent of our Lord, and, therefore, the theory that commences them with the "pushing" of the "ram," cannot be correct.

From all these facts, the reader will see that we must look for some other event to mark the beginning of those days, besides the "pushing" of the "ram," which, we think, will readily be seen by inquiring what they measure. To ascertain this, it will be necessary to carefully consider the question, in the 13th verse, which is: "How long shall be the vision concerning the *daily sacrifice*, and the *transgression of desolation*, to give *both* the *sanctuary* and the *host* to be *trodden under foot*?" This question, therefore, it will be seen, relates to the length of two things—first, the *daily sacrifice*; and, second, the *transgression of desolation*. These two things, therefore, must be just 2300 days long: the "*daily sacrifice*," we have already *fully* proved on pages 60 to 62 of this book, refers to the *true worship of God*—to the Jewish worship, or sacrifice, under the law, and to the Christian worship, or sacrifice under the Gospel; and therefore we shall adduce no further proof of it here. From the beginning, therefore, of the daily sacrifice to the end of the "transgres-

(10A)

sion of desolation," must be 2300 days. The "daily sacrifice" is the first thing measured, and the "transgression of desolation," the last; for, according to chapter xi: 31, and xii: 11, the "transgression of desolation" does not begin to tread under foot the "*sanctuary and the host*," until the "daily sacrifice" is taken away, and "the abomination that maketh desolate" is set up. The "transgression of desolation" is shown to be the power symbolized by the "little horn," of chapter viii, beginning with the 9th verse, (which is admitted, and must be, by all expositors to represent the Roman empire, since it represents that power or empire which succeeded the "he-goat," or Grecian empire); for it is declared of this "horn" (verse 10) that "it waxed great even to," or, as the margin correctly reads, "*against* the host of heaven: and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and STAMPED upon them." Verse 12: "Yea, he magnified himself even against" (Marg.) "the Prince of the host" (Christ), "and from him"—that is, from Christ—"the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his *sanctuary* was cast down.

Thus it is shown that the Roman power is the "transgression of desolation"—is the power that was to "take away the *daily sacrifice*," and "place," or "set up," "the abomination that maketh desolate," by which act it was to tread under foot the "*sanctuary and the host*." The "transgression of desolation," or Roman power, therefore, was only to tread under foot the "*sanctuary and the host*," from the time that the "daily sacrifice" was taken away, and the "abomination that maketh desolate" was set up; which is shown, in chapter xii: 11, to be the event which marks the beginning of the 1335 days, or years. And as the 1335 days or years, end at the coming of Christ, at which time also, as we have already clearly shown, the 2300 days end, it is thus proved that the "transgression of desolation," or "little horn," was only to exist, from the time that it began to tread under foot the *sanctuary and the host*, 1335 years out of the 2300. This would leave 965 days, of the 2300, as the measurement or length of the daily sacrifice, from where it began to where it was taken away, since 1335 taken from the 2300 leave 965. The "daily sacrifice," therefore, is the first thing measured by the 2300 days; and the "transgression of desolation," the last. The first or "daily sacrifice," is thus shown to be 965 years long; and the latter or "transgression of desolation," from where it began to tread under foot the *sanctuary and the host*, 1335 years long; and both together fill up the 2300 days or years.

The question then, "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" proves that the 2300 days must begin with the restoration of the "daily sacrifice," which was then in the future to be accomplished, as there was no daily sacrifice at the time Daniel saw the vision. That the sanctuary and the host were not to be trodden under foot the whole length of the 2300 days, is further proved, from the fact, that the transgression of desolation, or "little horn," does not exist that length of time, and, therefore, could not tread under foot the sanctuary and the host the whole length of the period.

Having now shown that the "daily sacrifice" was the first thing to be measured by the 2300 days, or years, therefore, we have fully established the fact, that when the daily sacrifice was fully restored, those days must have begun, as we can not begin to measure anything before the thing to be measured *really* exists.

The "daily sacrifice," at the time the 2300 days were given, as we have before remarked, did not exist, as it had not yet been restored since it ceased at the commencement of the Babylonian captivity. Therefore, it was to be subsequently restored.

But, before we proceed to show when this was done, it will first be necessary, since the chronology back of the cross is more or less unreliable, to examine the

"SEVENTY WEEKS,"

and the "going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," &c., of Dan. 9: 24-26. And as there has been, and is yet, we conceive, much misunderstanding on this subject, it will be necessary, that we should give it more than an ordinary investigation. We shall, therefore, make every point in the argument as clear as we can.

"Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy."

"*Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city.*" &c. This is supposed, by some, to show that the seven'y weeks extend, *not* to the destruction of Jerusalem, but to the time when Jerusalem fell into the hands of the Romans, which is supposed to have taken place in A. D., 65. But this is a very great mistake, for we are informed by Jose-

phus Ant. B. 17., C. 13, Ss. 2, 5, and B. 18, C. 1, S. 1, that Jerusalem fell into the hands of the Romans on the banishment of Archelous, which was no later than A. D. 12. The Historian says: "So *Archelous' country* was laid to the *province of Syria*; and *Cyrenius*, one that had been Consul, was sent by Cæsar to take account of the people's effects in Syria, and to *sell the house of Archelous*. * * * Caponius, also, a man of the equestrian order, was sent together with him, to have the SUPREME POWER over the JEWS." Thus we have proved that Jerusalem and the Jews fell into the hands of the Romans, no later than A. D. 12, instead of A. D. 65; nor can any one show that they were *any* more in their hands, at the latter period than they were at the former. We have thus shown, from the simple facts in history, that the theory that extends the 70 weeks to A. D. 65, cannot possibly be correct. Jerusalem was not destroyed until A. D. 70.

Having thus shown the above theory to be incorrect, from history, we shall next prove it by the *express* word of God. And first, what were the events that were to mark the end of the seventy weeks? They were as follows: 1. "To finish the transgression;" 2. "To make an end of sins;" 3. "To make reconciliation for iniquity;" 4. "To bring in everlasting righteousness;" and 5. "To seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy." These are the particulars, the accomplishment of which were to mark the end of the 70 weeks. But what took place, we ask, in A. D. 65, to fulfill them? Most certainly, nothing.

No one can be so blind, we think, as not to see, at a glance, that all these particulars take hold of, and are inseparably connected with, the crucifixion and resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ; hence the event which marks the termination of the 70 weeks is the establishment of the New Covenant. This will be seen more fully, however, hereafter. But we first wish to show where the 70 weeks commenced. This will readily be seen from the following facts and considerations:

"*Seventy weeks are determined*," &c. The word, in the original translated, "*determined*," is "*Khotokh*," which means, according to Gesenius, tropically, (which is its only meaning here, as must be admitted by all,) "*to divide*, hence to determine, to destine, to appoint." Our Translators and Commentators have universally chosen the word *determined* as its meaning; but its primary signification, as we have seen from Gesenius, is to "*divide*."

A. Pick's Bible Student's Hebrew Concordance translates *Khotokh*, "*to cut assunder*," which it will be seen, agrees with

Gesenius, and shows that the 70 weeks, instead of being "cut off" from some other period, was to be "divided," "cut asunder," that is, into two, three or more parts, and thus to be fulfilled.

That this position is correct, is further proved by the Septuagint translation, where we find the word *Khotokh* translated into the Greek by the word *Septemno*, which, according to Lydell and Scott's Greek and English Lexicon, means "*to cut all in pieces; to chop up; to divide.*" This we consider important testimony from the fact that it shows how the word was understood by the most learned Jews, over two thousand years ago.

The meaning of the Greek word *Septemno*, in the Septuagint translation, it will be seen, exactly agrees with the meaning of the Hebrew word *Khotokh*, according to Gesenius and Pick, and all go to show how the seventy weeks were to be fulfilled upon Daniel's people and holy city—that they were to be fulfilled in *divisions*, or parts. That this view is correct, is further proved by the explanation of the angel himself, as given in the 24th verse; for, after having declared that "seventy weeks are *divided* upon thy people, and upon thy holy city," &c., he says: "know **THEREFORE**, and understand:" the adverb "*therefore*," which means, "*for this reason*," shows positively and unmistakably that the angel has a direct reference to the 70 weeks, and that he is giving an explanation of the same; "Know *therefore*," that is, *for this reason*; for what reason? why, for the reason that the "70 weeks are *divided* upon thy people and upon thy holy city,"—"and understand;" "understand what? why, understand where they are to begin and how they are to be fulfilled—"that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks:—this is the first division of the 70; "and threescore and two weeks," the second; and the "one week" of the confirming of the "covenant," is the third.

This, then, is the angel's explanation of where the 70 weeks were to begin and the manner in which they were to be fulfilled.

We have thus shown, positively, 1st, by the Hebrew and Greek Lexicons, as to the meaning of the Hebrew word *Khotokh*, and 2dly, by the angel's explanation, that the "seventy weeks," and the sixty-nine weeks, are both connected together, and that, therefore, the seventy weeks commenced at "the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem."

The adverb "*therefore*" shows the connection of the two periods too clear to be doubted.

Again: that the seventy weeks were to begin at the "going forth of the commandment," is further proved from the fact, that this is the *only* event given to mark their beginning, or that of any other period in the 9th chapter. Hence, as there is *but one* event given, therefore we cannot be mistaken in the fact that this is the *one*.

Again: It is admitted by ALL that, if it can be proved that the "threescore and two weeks," of the 26th verse, are the *same* as the 'threescore and two weeks,' of the 25th verse, our position is correct, since it proves positively that the sixty-nine weeks extended to the cross and resurrection of Christ. That they are the same, we would first remark that none of the Commentators extant has ever seemed to question or doubt, which must be regarded as evidence of some considerable weight. And, second, they are proved to be the same from the true reading of the 26th verse; for Dr. Davidson, a learned Hebrew scholar from Halle College, in the 3d volume of his Notes to the Old Testament Scriptures, says that the 26th verse should read, according to the Hebrew: "And after THE three-score and two weeks"; and this reading agrees with Coverdale's translation, which reads: "after THESE threescore and two weeks."

In addition to these we find that Martin's Swiss Bible (which is said to be the best in the French language), reads: "Et apres ces soixante-deux semaines"; And the Paris edition of 1805 reads the same—"And after ALL THESE sixty-two weeks." Thus it will be seen that the French of Martin, and the Paris edition, agree with Coverdale and Dr. Davidson.

Again: Prof. Whiting (and there is no better authority), in his translations of the visions of Daniel, renders the 26th verse thus: "And after THE sixty and two weeks." Also, in the translation of the Old Testament, by Isaac Leeser, a learned Jewish Rabbi in Philadelphia, Dan. 9: 26, reads, "And after THE sixty and two weeks."

This shows that the threescore and two weeks in the 26th verse, are the same as in the 25th verse. With these facts and considerations before us, we will now read the two verses together, thus: "Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince, shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks." "And after THE threescore and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off." - What can be more

positively proved than this, that the 62 weeks in the second instance are the same 62 weeks in the first?

Thus it is shown that there is but one period of 62 weeks in the 9th chapter; and since the 62 weeks came *after* the "seven," it is positively proved that the 69 weeks extended to the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ; we say crucifixion and resurrection because their being so close together they are virtually but one event.

Again: The 69 weeks were to reach, as we have seen, "unto Messiah the Prince." The question now arises, when was Christ "Messiah the Prince?" Some suppose it was at his birth, and others at his resurrection.

Now the question arises, How shall we determine which is right? I answer, that a "messenger" is to precede the coming of the Messiah, and until that messenger does come, and prepare the way of the Lord, we may not look for him. "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me."—Mal. iii: 1. "The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord."—Is. xl: 3. This is the promise of the Lord, that a messenger should go before him to announce his coming. And this messenger was John the Baptist, who came up out of the wilderness in the fifteenth year of the government of Tiberius (Luke iii: 1), preaching repentance, confessing that he was the one spoken of by the prophet, saying, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord."—Matt. iii: 3; Mark i: 2, 4. And Christ speaking of John, said: "For this is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee."—Matt. xi: 10.

Jesus was born nearly thirty years before this; but he remained in obscurity until his baptism; and that the people were ignorant of him we learn from Luke iii: 15. When the "people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ, or not;" and the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem, to ask him, "Who art thou?" and he confessed, "I am not the Christ;" and they asked, "Who art thou? that we may give an account to them that sent us. What sayest thou of thyself?" "He said, I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness"—the Lord's harbinger. Nor did John himself know who the Messiah was: "And I knew him not: but him that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost."—John i: 33.

John announced to the Jews that the Messiah was to come *after* him: "He that cometh *after* me is mightier than I." And when John saw Jesus and knew him, he said, "This was he of whom I spake, He that cometh *after* me."

Thus it is shown that Christ could not have been the "Messiah the Prince" at his birth, since he was to come *after* John the Baptist: "He that cometh *after* me."

Again: The *universal meaning* of the word *Prince*, throughout the Scriptures, is *ruler*, one in *actual* authority. Being simply an *heir* to a throne, or a *king's son*, does not constitute one a *prince* according to the Bible. He must be *actually* in authority. We have examined this subject thoroughly, and know whereof we speak. Such was not our Saviour, as the "babe wrapt in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger." He was not at that time a *prince*, or *ruler*, although to this end he was born. His laws had not yet been given to the world; he exercised authority over no one, but he himself was subject to the authority of his parents. Such is not a *prince* in the world of God.

The true position of our Saviour, before and after the cross, will readily be seen in the following texts: Phil. ii: 7-10: "But made himself of *no reputation*, and took upon him the form of a *servant*, and was made in the likeness of men: And being found in fashion as a man, he *humbled himself*, and became obedient *unto death*, even the death of the cross. Wherefore God also hath *highly exalted* him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in the earth, and things under the earth."

Here Paul shows very clearly the time when Christ was exalted from that of a *servant*, having *no reputation*, to that of a *prince*. Jesus claimed himself, before his resurrection, to be a *servant*, and not a *prince*. See Luke xx: 27.

Again: Heb. ii: 9: "But we see Jesus, who was made a *little lower* than (or, as the margin reads, a *little while inferior* to) the angels for the suffering of death, *crowned with glory* and honor."

Thus Jesus, before his crucifixion, was *lower* than the angels, which shows that he could not have been a *prince* until after his resurrection, when being "CROWNED" with glory and honor, he became a "prince" in a true Scriptural sense.

That Christ was not a prince until after his resurrection is further proved in Acts iv: 30, 31: "The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew and hanged on a tree. Him

hath God *exalted* with his right hand *to be a prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins.*" Thus it is that Christ became a *prince*, in the *Scriptural* sense, after his resurrection; it was then that he was thus exalted, and not before. Hence, says Jesus, after that he was risen from the dead (Matt. xxviii: 18—"All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.")

Paul says (Rom. i: 4, 5) that he was "*declared to be the Son of God, with power, according to the spirit of Holiness, by the resurrection from the dead.*" 1st Peter, iii: 32: "Who is gone into heaven, and is on the right hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him." Eph. i: 20, 21: "Which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and set him on his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above *all principality, and power, and might, and DOMINION, and every name that is named, not only in THIS WORLD, but also in that which is come.*" Here Paul settles the question forever, that Christ is the *supreme* ruler over THIS WORLD, and has been ever since his resurrection. Acts ii: 36: "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God *hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.*" But *when and how* was "*that same Jesus*" made *both Lord and Christ*? We answer, at and by a resurrection from the dead, and consequently he was *not* "*both Lord and Christ*" before, but was, as we have abundantly shown, as a servant having no reputation.

We have now settled the question by the express word of God, that the sixty-nine weeks terminated at the cross and resurrection of Christ; we say cross and resurrection, because, that, being so near together, they are both, virtually, in the fulfillment of the sixty-nine weeks, but one event.

Having thus shown that the sixty-nine weeks extended to the cross, the "one week" of the confirming of the covenant, the last of the seventy, must have been fulfilled this side. And this is in harmony with Paul's testimony in Hebrews ix: 16, 17:

"For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.

"For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth."

Thus it is proved that the new covenant could not be confirmed until after the crucifixion.

That the new covenant is the one that was to be confirmed for the "one week," is positively proved from the fact that.

according to Daniel, the covenant that was to be confirmed is the one that Messiah, or Christ, is prince of: and Christ was never prince of any other covenant but the new. So there is no chance for mistake on this point.

In Hebrews ii: 3, 4, Paul tells us how the covenant was confirmed, thus:

“How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was CONFIRMED unto us by them that heard him;

“God also bearing them witness both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?”

The new covenant having thus been confirmed to the Jews for the one week or seven years after the resurrection of Christ, the seventy weeks were ended, and, by consequence, the gospel was, after that time, preached to the Gentiles, as we learn from Acts, chapter x.

No further or more positive evidence can be required, we are satisfied, by any one, to prove that our position on the seventy and the sixty-nine weeks, is correct, than we have now given, for we have proved, by the express word of God, that they began in harmony with each other—at the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem—and that the latter period (the sixty-nine weeks) extended to the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ.

This proves positively that the commandment given in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes is the one referred to in the prophecy of Daniel, since the sixty-nine weeks extending back from the cross, as we shall see presently, will not reach to any other commandment.

But again: We shall be fully able to show, we think, both from the Bible and from history that that is the *only* “commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem” that ever was given.

Some have supposed from a certain prophecy in Isaiah (chapter xlv: 28, and xlv: 13), which we shall notice particularly hereafter, that Cyrus must have given the commandment under consideration; but by referring to 2d Chronicles, xxxvi: 23, and Ezra i: 2, and vi: 3, where we have a full record of *all* that Cyrus, as an *individual*, commanded in relation to the matter, we find that the commandment given by him was confined *wholly* and *exclusively* to the *temple*. There is not a word about the building of Jerusalem, nor any provision made for it in his commandment.

The following are the texts above referred to: 1. 2d Chroni-

cles, xxxvi: 23. "Thus saith Cyrus, king of Persia, All the kingdoms of the earth hath the Lord God of heaven given me; and he hath charged me to build him AN HOUSE in Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? The Lord his God be with him, and let him go up."

2. Ezra i: 2: "Thus saith Cyrus, king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth; and he hath commanded me to build him AN HOUSE at Jerusalem, which is in Judah."

3. Chapter vi: 3: "In the first year of Cyrus the king, the same Cyrus the king, made a decree concerning THE HOUSE of God at Jerusalem. Let THE HOUSE be builded, the place where they offered sacrifices, and let the foundations thereof be strongly laid; the height thereof threescore cubits, and the breadth thereof threescore cubits."

Some have been "presumptuous enough," in trying to evade the above testimony in regard to the decree of Cyrus being confined *wholly* to the *temple*, to charge Ezra with "omitting to record the whole matter." This is an important admission, as it is admitting at once, as it must be by all, that if he DID "*record the whole matter*," our position is inevitably correct. Hence we will look at Ezra's testimony somewhat particularly.

It will be seen by the foregoing that we have the decree of Cyrus recorded *three times* over—once in 2d Chronicles and twice in Ezra—and in all three of these records the decree of Cyrus, as we have seen, is confined *wholly* to the *temple*. And if we were to admit that there might have been an omission in the first two records—in Chronicles and in Ezra i: 2—there is no chance for such an omission in the third—in chap. vi: 3—for that is a copy of the "*record*" of the king's "*roll*," as found at Achmetha, which gives the decree of Cyrus's *word* for *word*. This record, as we have already seen above, perfectly agrees with the other two. Thus the question is settled beyond dispute, that the decree of Cyrus embraced the building of the temple alone. Indeed, the decree of Darius and the testimony of the Jews themselves, as found in chapters v: 13-15, and vi: 6-10, should be sufficient to satisfy one and all in regard to this matter.

Thus it is positively proved that the decree of Cyrus related *wholly* to the temple alone; and a decree to build the *temple* is not a decree to build *Jerusalem*. The *temple* and *Jerusalem* are two wholly distinct things throughout the Scriptures. In *not a single instance*, in the Word of God, is the *temple*

called *Jerusalem*. But it is claimed that the decree of Cyrus embraced the building of Jerusalem, on the authority of Josephus.

But what if the history of Josephus, which is universally known by all who are acquainted with it, to contain a large number of errors, or interpolations, does contradict the Bible? Can any one be at a loss, for a moment, which to believe? We think not. But let us see what he does say in the matter; for it may be that we shall find, on a careful examination, that Josephus and the Bible do not differ so much after all.

In Ant. B. 11, ch. 1, sec. 1, we read as follows:

"And these things God did afford them" (that is, the Jews), for he stirred up the mind of Cyrus, and made him write thus throughout all Asia—"Thus saith Cyrus the king, since God Almighty both appointed me to be king of the habitable earth, I believe he is that God which the nation of the Israelites worship; for indeed he foretold my name by the prophets, and that I should build him A HOUSE at Jerusalem, in the country of Judea."

Thus it is shown that Josephus and the Bible perfectly agree—that the decree of Cyrus was wholly confined, as we have before stated, to the building of the *temple* alone. But it may be objected that Josephus afterward says that Cyrus gave the Jews leave to "rebuild their city Jerusalem," &c. To this we reply that this statement is beyond question, as will appear in a note by the translator at the bottom of the same page, where it is found, an *interpolation*; for in this note it is stated that "this leave to build Jerusalem," as recorded in secs. 2 and 3, "and this epistle of Cyrus to Sisinnus and Sethrabuzanes to the same purpose," is not to be found in all the copies of Josephus but this last one. The translator further states, in the same note, in reference to the *temple* thus: "The rebuilding of which is ALONE permitted, or directed in the decree of Cyrus, in *all our copies*." This, then, proves that the above statement in regard to Cyrus' giving leave to rebuild Jerusalem, is a palpable interpolation, for it is not only wanting in all the previous copies, but it positively makes Josephus contradict himself. That which must settle the matter forever, is the decree itself, in respect to which the Bible and Josephus, as we have seen, perfectly agree.

We have thus proved from both the Bible and history that Cyrus never gave a "commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," and much less did he build it, for he did not even build the temple. See Ezra vi; 15.

The commandment of Artaxerxes "to cause these men to cease, and that this city be not builded," is no proof that they were building Jerusalem, from the fact that the accusations of their adversaries (ch. iv: 12-17) was a FALSE accusation, as is *positively* proved from Ezra iv: 1-3, which reads as follows:

"Now when the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin heard that the children of the captivity builded the TEMPLE unto the Lord God of Israel:

2. "Then they came to Zerubbabel, and to the chief of the fathers, and said unto them, Let us build with you; for we seek your God, as ye do; and we do sacrifice unto him since the days of Esar-haddon, king of Assur, which brought us up hither.

3. "But Zerubbabel, and Joshua, and the rest of the chief of the fathers of Israel, said unto them, Ye have nothing to do with us to build AN HOUSE unto our God; but we ourselves together will build unto the LORD GOD of Israel, as king Cyrus, the king of Persia, hath commanded us."

See also ch. v: 13-17.

From the foregoing it will be seen that they were building nothing but the *temple alone*, in strict conformity with the commandment of Cyrus.

Any reference, therefore, to the accusations of their adversaries to prove that they were building the *city*, is out of place. But it is asked, "how could 49,697 Jews (Ezra ii: 64, 65) have dwelt in Jerusalem without houses, and therefore without having built the city." We answer that they did not dwell in Jerusalem, but, on the contrary, they dwelt in their "cities," or villages, in the country round about Jerusalem. This is proved from the following—Ezra ii:

Verse 70. "So the priests, and the Levites, and some of the people, and the singers, and the porters, and the Nethinims, dwelt in their *cities*, and ALL ISRAEL in their *cities*."

Neh. vii: 73. "So the priests, and the Levites, and the porters, and the singers, and some of the people, and the Nethinims, and ALL ISRAEL, dwelt in their cities; and when the seventh month came, the CHILDREN of ISRAEL were IN THEIR CITIES."

Thus it is shown that as late as the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes the Jews and ALL Israel dwelt in their cities *outside* of Jerusalem, for the simple reason that, as Nehemiah informs us in chapter vii: 4, the *houses* in Jerusalem were not yet built thus: "Now the city was large and great: but the people were *few* therein, and the *houses* WERE NOT BUILD-

(11A)

ED." This proves positively that Jerusalem, so far as the houses were concerned, had not been built previous to Nehemiah's time, and affords an explanation why *all Israel* dwelt in their cities outside of Jerusalem.

Says Josephus, Ant. B. 11, ch. 5, sec. 7: "But when Nehemiah saw that the city was *thin* of people, he exhorted the *priests* and the *Levites* that they would *leave the country*," (thus showing that even the *priests* and the *Levites* had not, up to that time, lived in the city, but in the country), "and remove to the *city*, and there continue; and *he built them houses at his own expense*."

We have thus proved positively, both from the Bible and from history, that Cyrus neither gave a "commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," nor did he build it.

The commandment given by Artaxerxes in his twentieth year is therefore proved to be the *only* commandment that ever was given to restore and to build Jerusalem, and, by consequence, we cannot be mistaken in this matter.

Says Nehemiah, in answer to Artaxerxes (ii: 3):

"Why should not my countenance be sad, when the *city*, the place of my fathers' sepulchres, *lieth waste*, and the gates thereof are consumed with fire?"

17. "Then said I unto them, Ye see the distress that we are in, how *Jerusalem lieth waste*, and the gates thereof are burned with fire."

Thus we learn that *Jerusalem* continued to lie waste up to the twentieth year of Artaxerxes.

Hence Nehemiah (verse 5) requested of the king that he would send him "unto Judah, unto the *CITY* of my fathers' sepulchres, that I may *BUILD IT*."

Here it will be seen that Nehemiah requested the very thing required, to fulfill the prophecy of Daniel. This of itself should be sufficient to satisfy every one on this subject.

The sixty-nine weeks commencing at this point ended at the cross, where we have shown that they must have ended according to the word of God.

The question now arises, in view of all these facts, how are we to understand Isaiah xlv: 28, and xlv: 13, which declares, among other things, that Cyrus should say to "*Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built*" and "*he shall build my city*?" We answer, that this prophecy in harmony with all such prophecies in the Bible, as we shall show, referred to *Cyrus's* dynasty, and not to Cyrus *individually*. This is sufficiently proved, 1. By the following declaration in reference to the building of the temple:

"And they builded, and finished it, according to the commandment of the God of Israel, and according to the commandment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes, king of Persia."—Ezra vi: 14.

Here it will be seen that the commandments of Darius and Artaxerxes had just as much to do with fulfilling the prophecy of Isaiah, in reference to the building of the temple, as that of Cyrus himself. Indeed, Josephus shows in Ant. B. 11, ch. 5, sections 6 and 7, that the temple was not finished until after Nehemiah obtained his commission.

The fact, then, that the temple was not built, according to the above declaration of Ezra, by the commandment of Cyrus, alone, is proof positive that Cyrus alone or individually was not meant; and if Cyrus did not as much as build the temple, what is it but the height of *presumptuousness* to say that he *built Jerusalem*?

Artaxerxes, who gave the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, as we have seen, was one of the dynasty of Cyrus, and, therefore, his legitimate successor; and as he acted in the "spirit and power" of Cyrus, he was just as much Cyrus in the aforementioned prophecy of Isaiah as Cyrus was himself. Whatever he did it was the same as though Cyrus did it.

But why, then, it is asked, did not Isaiah say *Artaxerxes* instead of *Cyrus*? We answer, because Artaxerxes was not the *head* of the dynasty that was to fulfill the prediction. It began to be fulfilled by Cyrus and terminated with Artaxerxes. Cyrus and Darius gave the commandments to build the temple, and Artaxerxes the commandment to build Jerusalem, so that it took the work of the three to fulfill the prophecy. This cannot be denied. This proves that Cyrus in the prophecy stood for the *dynasty*, and that therefore the name "Cyrus" applied to any of his legitimate successors just as much as it did to him. This principle runs throughout prophecy, as the following additional instances will most clearly prove:

2. It was declared of *Abraham*, in Gen. xii: 3, that "in **THEE** shall all the families of the earth be blessed," and yet it is universally admitted that this blessing declared in *Abraham*, was fulfilled in or through his seed—Jesus Christ. Here, then, we have an instance where a *particular* individual is specified and named, and yet fulfilled through another—his legitimate seed—on just the same principle as in the case of the prophecy of Isaiah.

3. In Ezek. xxxvii: 24, 25, it is said, "and *David my*

servant shall be king over them ;” and in Jer. xxx : 9—“But they shall serve the Lord their God, and *David their king*, whom I will raise up unto them. See, also, Hos. iii : 5. Now what can be more explicit, we ask, than the foregoing predictions in regard to David? They not only say *David*, but “*David my servant*,” and “*David your king*,” and yet, as admitted by all expositors, David, *individually*, was not meant, nor any one else by that name. Therefore those prophecies were to be fulfilled by his legitimate successors just the same as in the case of Cyrus. Many suppose that Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Hosea, in speaking of David, had reference to our Saviour; whether they did or not it does not alter the case, for Jesus *was not* David only on the principle of his being David’s legitimate successor, the same as Artaxerxes was Cyrus.

4. Again, Jacob’s *natural seed* are called *Jacob* on the same principle, that is, because they were his natural descendants.—Ps. xiv : 7, Rom. xi : 26.

5. In Mal. iv : 5, we have the prediction of the coming of “*Elijah the Prophet*.” But Jesus said in Matt. xvii : 12, in speaking of *John the Baptist*, “That *Elias* [Elijah] *is come already*; and in Mark ix : 13, “But I say unto you that *Elias* [Elijah] *is indeed come*, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him.”

Here we have another strong case—“Behold, I will send you *Elijah the Prophet*,” and yet this prophecy was fulfilled by John the Baptist, because he came in the “spirit and power of Elijah.”

6. In the 2d chapter of Daniel, 38th verse, it is declared to Nebuchadnezzar, “*Thou art this head of gold*.” Here it will be seen that Nebuchadnezzar stood for the whole *dynasty*, yet the positive declaration was to Nebuchadnezzar: “*Thou art this head of gold* ;” that is, he was the head of gold in his time, but when he had passed away then his legitimate successor was the head of gold, and so on to the end.

7. In Dan. vii : 8, 20, a “little horn” is brought to view, having “eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things.”

This “little horn” was to “pluck up three of the first horns by the roots.” This fact proves that the “little horn” represented the *Greek empire*, since that empire is the only power that ever “plucked up three of the first horns by the roots.” Now, the 21st verse declares that this “SAME HORN made war with the saints, and prevailed against them, until the ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the

saints of the Most High," and yet it is a fact, as we have already abundantly proved, and which is now generally admitted, that the Greek empire was succeeded in its war on the saints by at least six other nations; but the prophecy declares that this "*same horn*," that is, the "*same horn*" that plucked up three of the first horns by the roots, "made war on the saints and prevailed against them," &c. This same principle is carried out in all the prophecies, hence "horns," "heads" and "angels" stand for dynasties, classes, &c.

We might adduce many other instances to establish this principle in regard to the fulfillment of such prophecies as the one under consideration, if we thought it necessary.

The next point to settle in the order, is the true date of the cross, as we are dependent on this in order to fix the true date of the twentieth of Artaxerxes, or of the "going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem." This, we think, we shall be able to settle without difficulty. First, it is a settled fact, and admitted by all parties, that the crucifixion of our Lord could not have taken place later than in the year in which Tiberius Cæsar died, which, according to all chronologists, was in A. D. 37. But it is supposed by many that he could not have been crucified so late as that. To this supposition (for it is nothing but a supposition, as we shall soon show) we reply, that if He was not crucified as late as that, then the 2300 days have already ended; but this is not the case, as the events which were to take place at their termination have not yet been accomplished.

That Christ was crucified in the same year in which Tiberius Cæsar died, we will now proceed to prove.

Josephus, in Ant. B. 18, ch. 4, sections 2, 3, says, in speaking of the death of Tiberius Cæsar:

"So Vitellius sent Marcellus, a friend of his, to take care of the affairs of Judea, and ordered Pilate to go to Rome, to answer before the emperor, to the accusations of the Jews. So Pilate, when he had tarried ten years in Judea, made haste to Rome, and this in obedience to the orders of Vitellius, which he durst not contradict; but before he could get to Rome, Tiberius was dead. *But Vitellius came into Judea and went up to Jerusalem*; it was at the time of that festival which is called the passover."

Thus we learn from Josephus that *after* Vitellius ordered Pilate to go to Rome, before whose arrival there, *Tiberius was dead*, he (Vitellius) came into Judea, and went up to Jerusalem, and that it was at the time of the passover. Now, Josephus tells us, in the same section, that while Vitellius was

here, he deprived Caiphas of the high priesthood. Here, then, we have settled the fact by Josephus, beyond all mistake, that Caiphas was not deprived of the high priesthood until after the death of Tiberius, for no one can deny the unmistakable fact from Josephus, that the coming of Vitellius into Judea, at the time he deprived Caiphas of the high priesthood, was *after* he ordered Pilate to go to Rome; and no one can deny the fact also, that before Pilate, who made haste to Rome in obedience to the orders of Vitellius, could get there, Tiberius was dead. No amount of special pleading can alter these facts.

Some have attempted to show that Caiphas was not deprived of the high priesthood at the passover, in the same year and immediately after the death of Tiberius, because that he (Josephus) *afterward*, (that is, after he relates the fact that Vitellius deprived Caiphas of the high priesthood,) gives a history of some circumstances and events that transpired before his (Tiberius') death. To this we reply, that if this proves that Caiphas was not deprived of the high priesthood, as above stated, it also proves that Tiberius did *not* die after Vitellius ordered Pilate to go to Rome. But Josephus says that "before he [Pilate] could get to Rome, Tiberius was *dead*;" so that any attempt to show that Caiphas was not deprived of the high priesthood at the passover in the same year in which Tiberius died, is an attempt to show that Josephus contradicts himself, and if so, then there are no means whatever of knowing when the cross took place; for the fact that Vitellius went up to Jerusalem after he ordered Pilate to go to Rome, is beyond all possible mistake, if Josephus' statements are to be relied upon.

We have thus proved, so far as anything can be proved by history, that Caiphas was not deprived of the high priesthood until the passover in A. D. 37, since, as before stated, that is the year, according to all chronologists, in which Tiberius died.

This point, therefore, we now consider settled, and, by consequence, we shall next proceed to show, from the word of God, that Christ was not crucified until the last year of the high priesthood of Caiphas.

This is proved in Acts iv: 6, which reads as follows:

"And Annas, THE high priest, and Caiphas, and John, and Alexander; and as many as were of the KINDRED of THE high priest, were gathered together at Jerusalem."

Here we have the fact proved, beyond question, that no later than the first pentecost after our Lord was crucified, Annas was THE High Priest.

Let us look at the above testimony from Acts again :
 “And Annas, THE HIGH PRIEST, and Caiphas, and John, and Alexander ; and as many as were of the KINDRED of THE HIGH PRIEST.”

What can be more positive testimony than this to prove that Annas was *the* High Priest at that time ? Most certainly there cannot be any.

It will be seen, also, that in chap. v : 17, 24, 27, Annas is referred to as *the* high priest, since no one else is mentioned as the high priest after chap. iv : 6, to which the above verses could possibly have referred. Caiphas, the preceding high priest, it will be seen, is mentioned in the connection, but not as high priest ; only as the *kindred* of the high priest, which could not have been the case, if he was at the same time the *real* and *only* high priest.

In Luke iii : 2, we have it stated, virtually, that Annas and Caiphas were both high priests at the same time, thus : “Annas and Caiphas being *the high priests*, the word of God came unto John, the son of Zacharias, in the wilderness.”

It is supposed by many that Annas is here mentioned as high priest in connection with Caiphas, for no other reason than the fact of having previously been high priest, and being, at the time mentioned by Luke, father-in-law to Caiphas. How this may be, we will not now undertake to say positively, but admitting this to be true, for the sake of the argument, it does not weaken the testimony of the same apostle in Acts iv : 6, to prove that Annas was the *real* and *only* high priest at that time, that is, at the first pentecost after the crucifixion ; for if the same circumstances still existed—if Caiphas was still the *real* and *only* high priest—then Luke (for Luke wrote also the Acts of the Apostles) could not have failed, on this principle, to have associated them together in the high priesthood as at the first ; for it is not possible, if Caiphas was the *real* high priest, that he could have been left out altogether, and Annas, who was no high priest *at all*, could have been called THE high priest in his stead.

The idea of calling Annas *the* high priest, who was no high priest at all, and leaving out Caiphas, *who was the* high priest, and calling him, with others, simply the *kindred* of the high priest, is perfectly absurd.

The testimony of Acts iv : 6, is positive that Caiphas was not high priest at that time. We have thus proved, by the word of God, that Christ was crucified in the last year of the high priesthood of Caiphas, and, by consequence, we have fixed the crucifixion of our blessed Lord to the passover, of

A. D. 37, since we have proved, by Josephus, that it was at that passover that Caiphas was deposed from the high priest's office.

We might give more testimony on this point, but we think the foregoing quite sufficient.

Now, as we have previously proved that the sixty-nine weeks, or, 483 years terminated at the crucifixion and resurrection of our blessed Lord, we have, therefore, now definitely settled the fact that they terminated at the passover, in the Spring of A. D. 37.

This fixes the twentieth of Artaxerxes, or the "going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," in B. C. 447, as the sixty-nine weeks, or 483 years from B. C. 447, diminished by one, would end in A. D. 37, which is the latest point that can possibly be fixed.

This, it will be seen, is but one year earlier than it is put down in the chronology of our Bibles, for there it will be seen that the twentieth of Artaxerxes is put down to B. C. 446.

This proves that the chronology back of the cross is but one year out of the way, after all the fault that has been found with it.

We have now proved that the cross cannot be brought this side of A. D. 37, from the fact that that is admitted by all chronologists to be the date of the death of Tiberius Cæsar, consequently the "commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem" *could not* have gone forth this side of B. C. 447.

Having now settled the true date of the going forth of the commandment, we shall next consider the restoration of the "daily sacrifice," and thus fix the true starting point of the 2300 days. And first, we would remark that the restoration of the "daily sacrifice" must, in the very nature of the case, take place some time *subsequently* to the "going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem." Hence, as we have proved that the commandment went forth in the twentieth of Artaxerxes, therefore we must find the restoration of the "daily sacrifice" some time subsequently to that event, for the word *restore*, beyond question, has reference in part, if not in the main, to the *restoration* of the "daily sacrifice;" for that was one of the principal things that was to be *restored*, and which is sufficiently proved from the fact that the 2300 days were to measure it from its beginning. Therefore, the "daily sacrifice" was to be *restored, not partially, but fully*, under the commandment "to restore and to build Jerusalem."

A *partial* restoration, such as occurred in the first year of Cyrus and the sixth of Darius, does not fulfill the prophecy; it must be a *full* and *permanent* restoration. For instance, suppose an individual was commanded to measure a certain railroad in order to find its exact length, he would not measure *detached* portions that had been *half* finished and *abandoned*—that had no real connection with the railroad which he was commanded to measure—but he would measure it from where it *was a railroad*—from where it was continuous and in running order. Any portion *half* finished and *abandoned* and *distant*, or *unconnected* with either end, he most certainly would never think of measuring, because it would be no part of it, even if it had at some time been so designed.

God never recognizes any *half* or *imperfect* fulfillments of his word, as we have seen in our past arguments on the shorter periods; if He did, as there are so many such fulfillments, we could never be sure as to when and where it was fulfilled, and, therefore, could never be sure of being right. What we want, then, to mark the beginning of the 2300 days is a *complete* or *perfect* restoration of the “daily sacrifice,” according to the word of God. This restoration, as we have before remarked, must take place also some time subsequent to the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem, and, therefore, some time subsequent to the twentieth year of Artaxerxes.

It is inconsistent to suppose that the “daily sacrifice” could be restored the very moment the commandment was given to *restore*. This shows what we have shown before—that the 2300 days do not begin with the seventy and sixty-nine weeks.

The seventy weeks, as we have already proved, were not to be cut off from the 2300 days, but were to be fulfilled according to the meaning of the original Hebrew word *khotokh*—in divisions or parts.

That the daily sacrifice was restored in the thirty-third year of Artaxerxes B. C. 434, at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, we shall now proceed to show.

First, it is proved by Nehemiah that he went up to Jerusalem to *build it*, in the twentieth year of the reign of Artaxerxes, and continued in the work for twelve years, until the thirty-second year of the same king, when he says: “I gave my brother, Hanani, and Hananiah, the ruler of the palace, charge over Jerusalem.” See Nehemiah v: 14, and viii: 1-3.

The next thing he did was to take the genealogy of the people, after which he returned to Jerusalem, which was, as he

informs us in chapters v: 14, and xiii: 6, in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes, where he remained "*certain days*," and then returned back to Jerusalem again. From the fact that he says: "*After certain days*" he "obtained leave of the king and came to Jerusalem," it is evident that it was not a full year. Therefore, we cannot date his return back to Jerusalem again later than the thirty-third year of Artaxerxes. After his return to Jerusalem the dedication of the wall came off, the account of which is given, commencing at the 27th verse of chapter xii.

We say *after* his return, for at the dedication of the wall, we are informed (chap. xiii: 1-3) that, "On that day they read in the book of Moses in the audience of the people; and therein it was found written, that the Ammonite and Moabite should not come into the congregation of God forever; because they met not the children of Israel with bread and with water, but hired Balaam against them, that he should curse them; howbeit, our God turned the curse into a blessing. Now it came to pass, when they had heard the law, that they *separated from Israel all the mixed multitude.*"

Now let it be observed that Nehemiah says, in the 4th and 5th verses, that "*before this* [that is, before the dedication of the wall and the reading of the book of Moses], Eliashib the priest, having the oversight of the chamber of the house of our God, was allied unto Tobiah: And he had prepared for him a great chamber, where aforetime they laid the meat-offerings, the frankincense, and the vessels, and the tithes of the corn, the new wine, and the oil, which was commanded to be given to the Levites, and the singers, and the porters, and the offerings of the priests."

Now let it further be observed, that Nehemiah says, in the next (6th) verse, "*But in all this time was not I at Jerusalem*: for in the two and thirtieth year of Artaxerxes, king of Babylon, came I unto the king, and *after certain days* obtained I leave of the king:" &c.

Thus it is positively proved that the dedication of the wall was after Nehemiah's return back to Jerusalem. From the above it is proved that, as soon as Nehemiah went back to Artaxerxes, Eliashib the priest, who was allied to Tobiah, the great enemy of the Jews, took possession of everything, and turned the *temple* of God into a storehouse for Tobiah.

It will be seen, by reading the whole of the 13th chapter, that the Jews, up to this time, were a mixed multitude of *Ammonites*, *Moabites* and *Ashdodites*, for Nehemiah says, in the 23d verse: "In those days also saw I Jews that had mar-

ried wives of *Ashdod*, of *Ammon*, and of *Moab*; and their children spake half in the speech of *Ashdod*, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each people. And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and cut off their hair, and made them swear by God, saying, Ye shall not give your daughters unto their sons, nor take their daughters unto your sons, or for yourselves. * * * And one of the sons of *Joiada*, the son of *Eliashib*, the high priest, was son-in-law to *Sanballat*, the *Horonite*: therefore I chased him from me."

Indeed, everything up to that time (the time of the dedication of the wall) was in a complete state of defilement. Not only were the *temple* and the *people* defiled and the former forsaken, but the defilement had extended even to the "*priesthood*, and the covenant of the *priesthood*, and of the *Levites*;" for so *Nehemiah* declares in the 29th verse, thus: "Remember them, O, my God, because they have defiled the *priesthood*, and the covenant of the *priesthood*, and of the *Levites*."

This, then, was the condition of things up to the dedication of the wall in the thirty-third year of *Artaxerxes*, B. C. 434.

But *Nehemiah*, having now thoroughly cleansed the temple, the people, the priesthood and the Levites, and having fully restored the "daily sacrifice," and set everything in order according to the reading of the law, he winds up his book as follows:

"Thus cleansed I them from all strangers, and appointed the wards of the priests and the Levites, every one in his own business.

"And for the wood-offering, at times appointed, and for the first fruits. Remember me, O, my God, for good."

Thus, then, the work of restoring the daily sacrifice was completed B. C. 434, which gives us the true starting point for the 2200 days. Nor can they be started any later, from the fact that the work of restoring the daily sacrifice, was here completed.

The 2300 days, or years, beginning at this point, B. C. 434, must end in A. D. 1867, since 470 years of the 2300 ended A. D. 37, that is, the sixty-nine weeks, or, 483 years, began B. C. 447, and ended in A. D. 37. From the beginning of the 483 years, in the twentieth of *Artaxerxes*, B. C. 447, to the thirty-third of *Artaxerxes*, B. C. 434, where the daily sacrifice was restored, is thirteen years. This thirteen years deducted from the 483 years, leave 470 of the 2300 anterior to the cross. Therefore, if we deduct the 470 years from the 2300, it leaves just 1830 years of the 2300 to be fulfilled on

this side of the cross, which, beginning in A. D. 37, must end in A. D. 1867, in harmony with the 1335 years, as we have already abundantly proved.

Now, although we have proved unmistakably that the prophetic periods—the 1335 and the 2300—extend to A. D. 1867, and that, therefore, the Lord will come *some time during that year, at the latest*, yet we do not wish to be understood as postponing the coming of the Lord necessarily to that point, since, according to all precedent, he may come any time during the last year of those periods.

Let all strive to be ready at once, for there is now no time for delay. A very few short months more and Jesus will be here, praise his holy name! Come, brethern and sisters, awake, awake, and gird on thine armor anew; let us finish the conflict manfully, for such only will get into the kingdom, when Jesus, our Captain, comes. To the poor sinner and backslider we would say, "*Flee, O, flee*, to Christ without a moment's delay." He still sits on the mercy seat, and therefore you may find pardon and be saved. His blood is still efficacious, has lost none of its cleansing power, and therefore you may come, notwithstanding the shortness of time, and be cleansed from all your sins, and thus be fitted to reign with him in glory throughout eternity.

In conclusion, we would exhort all the friends of the truth to be interested in putting these pamphlets into the hands of every one who can be induced to read them, as by so doing you may be instrumental in saving some that would otherwise have been lost. Remember, that if they are lost through your neglect of duty, their blood will be required at your hands. If this last glorious light of truth has been caused to shine upon your pathway, is it not clearly your duty to do what you can to cause it to shine on the pathway of others? You will, no doubt, answer in the affirmative. Let all, therefore, be in earnest in the matter, as what we do now, must be done quickly. Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.

